REPORT RESUMES

ED 019 750 EA 001 345

IMPROVING INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS THROUGH TITLE III OF THE NDEA.

BY- GAARDER, A. BRUCE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION (DHEW), WASHINGTON, D.C.
REPORT NUMBER OE-29065 PUB DATE 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS. 107P.

DESCRIPTORS- *INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT, *PUBLIC SCHOOLS, STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION, EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *FEDERAL AID, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, RESEARCH, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS, LABORATORY EQUIPMENT, EDUCATIONAL EQUIPMENT, SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION, STATE FEDERAL SUPPORT, STATE SCHOOL DISTRICT RELATIONSHIP, *EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, NDEA,

THIS REPORT COVERS THE ACTIVITIES WHICH OCCURRED DURING FISCAL YEAR 1964, UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF TITLE III OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT. IT REPORTS THE MAJOR FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL JOINT EFFORTS TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP AT THE STATE LEVEL AND THE ACQUISITION OF TEACHING MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT AT THE LOCAL LEVEL WITH THE HELP OF FEDERAL FUNDS. QUESTIONS OF HOW THE TITLE III FUNDS WERE EXPENDED IN FISCAL YEAR 1964 AND HOW THAT EXPENDITURE AFFECTED INSTRUCTION IN CRITICAL SUBJECT AREAS ARE ANSWERED. THE REPORT ALSO DESCRIBES THE GROWING BODY OF FISCAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND INSTRUCTIONAL PROCEDURES WHICH HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED IN THE STATES TO STRENGTHEN THEIR PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTION AT ALL LEVELS THROUGH THE USE OF TITLE III AUTHORITY AND FUNDS. IN ALL CASES THE PROCEDURES ARE ILLUSTRATED BY EXAMPLES TAKEN DIRECTLY FROM THE ANNUAL NARRATIVE REPORT WHICH EACH STATE MAKES OF ITS TITLE III PROGRAM. AN APPENDIX CONTAINS FINANCIAL AND STATISTICAL DATA ON THE 50 STATES, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE CANAL ZONE, GUAM, PUERTO RICO, AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE AS CATALOG NO. FS 5.229--29065 FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402, FOR $0.55. (HW)

ED019750

Improving Instruction National Defense Education Act

IMPROVING INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS THROUGH TITLE III OF THE NDEA

EA 001 345

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, programs under Title III of the National Defense Education Act, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, must be operated in compliance with this law.

OE-29065

Improving Instruction in the Public Schools through Title III of the NDEA

By A. Bruce Gaarder
Specialist, Foreign Languages
Instructional Resources Branch
Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
John W. Gardner, Secretary
Office of Education
Harold Howe II, Commissioner

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.229 : 29065

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1966

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 55 cents

Contents

Page

Introduction ---------- 1

1.0 Strengthening the Professional Leadership in State Departments of Education ---------- 3
  1.1 Role of the State's Corps of Specialist Supervisors ---------- 3
  1.2 Utilizing all the State's Educational Resources ---------- 5

2.0 Improving the Education of Public School Teachers ---------- 8
  2.1 Strengthening the Preservice Education of Teachers ---------- 9
  2.2 Meeting the Demand for Inservice Education ---------- 10
    2.2.1 Extent of the Inservice Education Provided ---------- 13

3.0 Stimulating Curriculum Revision ---------- 16

4.0 Encouraging Research and Demonstration Projects ---------- 19

5.0 Evaluation of the Title III Program in Fiscal Year 1964 ---------- 21
  5.1 Extent of Participation in the Title III Program ---------- 21
  5.2 Extent of the Use of Updated Teaching Materials ---------- 22
  5.3 Adequacy of Laboratory and Classroom Equipment ---------- 23
  5.4 Longer Sequences of Foreign Language Study ---------- 25
  5.5 Evidence of Greater Scholastic Achievement ---------- 26

6.0 Successful Administrative Practices ---------- 27
  6.1 Making the Most of the Title III Project ---------- 27
  6.2 Using State Standards and Priorities to Assure Quality and Give Direction ---------- 30
  6.3 Techniques of Title III Program Evaluation ---------- 32

7.0 Problems, Needs, Highlight Statements ---------- 35
  7.1 Problems and Needs ---------- 35
  7.2 Highlight Statements ---------- 36

Appendix ---------- 39
  Financial and Statistical Data on the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—Fiscal Year 1964 and Fiscal Years 1959–64 (summary) ---------- 39

INTRODUCTION

This is a report of the major Federal-State-local joint effort to improve instruction in the public elementary and secondary schools of the Nation through the development of ever-stronger professional leadership at the State level and the acquisition of teaching materials and equipment at the local level with the help of Federal funds. It is a report of activities, nationwide, to establish in each State department of education a strong corps of highly trained subject-matter and education specialists, surround them with supporting personnel in related areas—librarians, experts in school planning, technicians in audiovisual facilities, etc.—and make them the focal point for intensive programs of inservice training for teachers, curriculum planning and revision by teachers, upgrading of the State's educational standards, and vertical coordination of education in the affected fields among all levels of instruction.

It is a report of the activities during fiscal year 1964 (July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1964) under the authority of title III of the National Defense Education Act.[1]

Former U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, in an address entitled "Education and the States," given in Tampa, Fla., on November 14, 1964, said:

> . . . it is essential for us to recognize what the Federal role in education is and can be—and what it is not and cannot be. And, more important, we need to recognize what the State role is today and what it must become tomorrow.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Through State educational leadership with local autonomy, the American public school has been a prime contributor to our personal, social, and national wellbeing. It has kept education close to the people. It has been a moderator of conflicting issues, a harmonizer of special interests. It has provided a training ground for leaders and responsible citizens in our free and open society. It has long been a guarantee that no central agency could control the minds of our young, and a built-in safeguard that if mistakes are made at the State and local level, they can usually be corrected before becoming national mistakes.
>
> But today, in education, we have reached a new magnitude of challenge. The social and economic changes now underway place a far higher order of demand and stress upon our educational institutions than ever before. Most of this stress inevitably falls upon the educational leadership of our States, and, in large measure, upon our State departments of education . . . .
>
> In the long run, therefore, nothing that we in education can do, whether in Washington or anywhere else, can be more important than strengthening the capacity of our States to respond to the educational needs of our time.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In raising the status of American education within our society, it is clear that we must begin by raising the status of State departments of education . . . if education is to fulfill its potential, there are no agencies more vital to our general welfare. As [James B.] Conant[2] says, "I am convinced that the future welfare of our public schools will be promoted by the organization of excellent State departments of education . . . ."

The Conant and Keppel view of the preeminent role of the State departments of education and their recommendation that the role be further strengthened receives direct and powerful support from title III, NDEA, and the trends observed during the first six years of title III indicate that, in the future, support will be even stronger and more effective. The Congress in drafting the NDEA established the Federal-State relationship that was to obtain by its prohibition in title I, section 102, of any Federal control of education. The same relationship was established for title III with special effectiveness by provision for the development in each State's department of education of a strong corps of specialists who would be able to exert professional control (as opposed to the much simpler fiscal control) over the huge materials and equipment acquisition program authorized by the title.

---

[1] The activities here reported are limited to the fields of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, but following the October 1964 amendments to the NDEA, they will also cover in substantially the same ways five additional areas: English, reading, history, geography, and civics. Title III was further amended in 1965 to include economics.

[2] James B. Conant, "Shaping Educational Policy."

Thus, the 6-year history, and particularly the fiscal year 1964 history of title III, is an account of steadily expanded and improved efforts under its section 302(b) to establish State-level supervisory and related services. These services could in turn help to guarantee that the much larger sums available as matching grants under its section 302(a) for the purchase of teaching materials and equipment would, in fact, contribute maximally to instruction in the local schools.

Even more important, however, than their efforts to use the materials and equipment acquisition money wisely has been the widespread and all-permeating influence of the corps of professional specialists upon other aspects of education in the States. There were, to be sure, subject-matter specialists in the State departments of education before the passage of the NDEA: in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages a total of 33. The difference at the end of fiscal year 1964 was not so much in the increased number of these persons (90 in science, 68 in mathematics, 14 in science and mathematics combined, and 55 in modern foreign languages) as in the vastly increased sense of how they could work most effectively and in the clearly established need which they are filling in the local schools. The striking difference derives from the distinctive nature of title III: the combination of funds and authority to employ the staff of subject matter specialists and related services personnel, funds to make possible widespread inservice education programs, and funds with which to acquire for use in the local schools the best available teaching materials and equipment.

This report will answer the very basic question "How were the title III funds expended in fiscal year 1964, and how did that expenditure affect instruction in the critical subject areas?" In addition to this fiscal accounting and evaluation, the report describes the growing body of procedures—fiscal, administrative, and instructional—which have been developed in the States to strengthen their professional leadership and improve instruction at all levels through the use of the title III authority and funds. In all cases the procedures are illustrated by examples taken directly from the annual narrative report which each State makes of its title III program. Limitations of space preclude the use of many such examples to illustrate each point. In each case, however, the examples represent the consensus of those most concerned with the particular item.

The report is designed as an overview of accomplishment under NDEA, title III. At the same time it is meant to show the best that has been accomplished. To do this entails the exercise of judgment. The judgment is that of the State-level administrators of the NDEA program (rather than the supervisors themselves) and of the title III administrative staff in the U.S. Office of Education, who now have 6 years of experience in reviewing each State's title III program through semiannual visits to the State capitals, annual reports from each State, and countless visits to local schools which have participated in the program.

The fact that the report is limited—necessarily—to the NDEA, title III program in each State does not imply unawareness of the work and the contribution at both the State and local levels of other persons and programs concerned with the improvement of instruction.

IMPROVING INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS THROUGH TITLE III OF THE NDEA

1.0 *Strengthening the Professional Leadership in State Departments of Education*

It is probably safe to say that the role of State departments of education in our country is on the whole a rapidly changing one. The change, stated in extreme terms, is from the modest, unassuming, static role of a neutral administrative agency which cautiously avoids any semblance of intervention or involvement in local school affairs and is not directly concerned with instruction, to the more vigorous, dynamic role of an agency which subordinates fiscal and administrative considerations to professional ones and accepts as its responsibility the constant improvement of instruction. Those States which accept the desirability of this kind of change have found in title III a strong means of accelerating it. Conversely, title III is perhaps least successful in the States which have not readily accepted the role of increasing professional leadership.

1.1 *Role of the State's Corps of Specialist Supervisors*

Scores of examples found in the States' annual reports of title III show improvement of instruction as a direct function of professional leadership. Each State through its corps of specialist supervisors plays an increasing role, coordinating all of the State's resources—professional people of all kinds, scientists, technicians, business, industry, the colleges and universities—in a constant effort to enrich the schools' programs and upgrade their teachers. Inevitably this coordination results in the development of leadership at the local school level and ultimately, ideally, every single teacher is touched, helped to grow professionally, and enabled to do more for his students. The title III administrator in Connecticut has expressed the view held in most States: "The leadership role of the consultant [supervisor] is probably his most important responsibility. . . ." In California the State board and superintendent are making a statewide study of the department of education "to determine how the department can more adequately provide leadership to bring about educational change for the improvement of instruction in the classroom."

The title III administrator in Maine makes it very plain—and voices the consensus of his counterparts in the other States—that of the four parts of title III (supervisory leadership, the acquisitions program, related services, minor remodeling) the most important is supervisory leadership:

> The leadership offered by supervisory personnel as well as the information provided and influences exerted in the various subject fields were considered the most valuable assets in the improvement of instruction . . . the leadership factor cannot be emphasized too strongly.

New Jersey has couched the matter in these terms:

> The outstanding strength of the New Jersey title III program has been the strength of the consultant staff in its ability to assist and improve local districts' educational programs. The number of requests for assistance is greater than the present time and staff available to meet them.

Pennsylvania's report was no less explicit:

> The fundamental strength provided by specialist [supervisors] is their ability to provide leadership in curriculum and instructional improvement.

All together, the 54 reports[1] bespeak a growing realization that the results expected from title III can best be achieved through the authority to support supervisory services. Yet it is quite unlikely that any State, even the wealthiest one, could employ a corps of supervisory specialists large enough to comply, in person, with all the requests for assistance from its local school districts. Alabama spoke for virtually all of the States in regard to this, reporting that, "The demand for their services is more than they can possibly fill." There is need, therefore, for procedures which multiply and extend widely the influence of the supervisor beyond the limits of what he can do in person. The States' annual title III reports give abundant examples of ways of achieving this multiplied and extended influence, even with a limited budget, by marshaling and utilizing all of the State's educational resources.

---

[1] The 50 States, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

Iowa reports on one of the basic procedures, resulting from the development of local professional leadership:

> In phase I, 2 groups of elementary school science teachers (50 in all) were given eight 2-hour sessions at 2 different centers in the State, dealing with the unit method of teaching and the discovery of investigative techniques of teaching science, with emphasis upon teacher-trainee participation in all of the techniques and practices. The phase I sessions were planned by the State supervisors and university and Office of Education consultants. Expenses were met through title III. Phase II was a series of repetitions of phase I, with each of the phase I participants conducting a similar workshop in his own home center, attended by a group of local teachers of science. In all, more than 650 teachers participated in these training sessions, or about 3.5 percent of the elementary school classroom teachers. The expenses of phase II sessions were paid by local districts. The same thing was done for the mathematics teachers.

Illinois shows one of many variants of this procedure:

> In order to make the mathematics workshops more effective (there were 60, attended by 6,491 teachers) they developed the 1-day "Director's Conference." The first one was for 35 high school teachers who would then direct workshops for grade school teachers. Southern Illinois University cooperated in the venture. It was successful and will be repeated in various parts of the State next year.

The influence of the specialist supervisor is increasingly diverse and pervasive.

Tennessee speaks of new school buildings:

> In recent months the science supervisors have spent a considerable amount of time serving as consultants to local systems and architects in planning science departments for new buildings.

North Carolina speaks of the curriculum and the equipment:

> Each time a school administrative unit plans to build a new school, the science, mathematics, and modern foreign language supervisors are called upon to aid the local school personnel in planning the curriculum and equipment to meet the needs of the students.

Utah refers to the problems of textbook adoption:

> The specialist in mathematics education prepared a paper supporting annual textbook adoption for a committee of the State school office staff. Later this paper in revised form was presented to the entire staff and to the State textbook commission. It was one of the factors leading to a change in textbook adoption practices. Now there will be an annual appraisal of text materials so that additions and deletions to the State recommended textbook list can be made each year.

South Carolina talks about major curriculum revision:

> During the past two years many schools have revised the science program to include a sequence of life science for grade 7, earth science for grade 8, and physical science for grade 9. This is the result of an effort to strengthen the program on the junior high level in accordance with a suggested program as outlined in "A Guide For Teaching Science For South Carolina," developed through the efforts of the science supervisor.

West Virginia takes up the same theme:

> The science supervisor escorted school officials of Raleigh County to certain new schools in the Roanoke, Va., area for the purpose of gaining information on the construction of two new high schools in Raleigh County. These new schools will have complete laboratory facilities for all the sciences, including greenhouses for the biology classes.

New Hampshire's report exemplifies the growing importance nationwide of the supervisor as a liaison between the schools and higher education:

> The science supervisor worked with the physics department at the University of New Hampshire in determining the need for an inservice institute for teachers of physics and in developing the proposal for that institute. He addressed the science methods courses at Plymouth State College and at Keene State College, and was guest lecturer at one session of the Elementary School Program extension course.

From Nevada it is reported that the foreign language supervisor has helped to plan and administer the University of Nevada NDEA Institute for Teachers of French, serving on leave-without-pay status from his title III position. The New Jersey science supervisor achieved a special kind of liaison with the business and industrial community:

> It was felt that visits should be made also to businesses and industries . . . . Contact was made with such concerns as Western Electric Research Laboratory, Bell Telephone Laboratories, the Industrial Reactor Research Center, Garrett Corp., Lockheed Co., and Edison Research Laboratories. Information resulting from these contacts was useful in advising schools concerning: (1) types of scientific employment available to their graduates; and (2) new and useful science teaching materials.

These excerpts from the States' narrative reports on title III illustrate the role of the specialist supervisor as it is developing in most of the States. Yet there are still a few States which seem to see that role limited to giving advice on the purchase and use of equipment. From West Virginia and Washington—to cite but two examples—it is reported that the supervisory staff prepares its own budget requests, detailing the proposed activities and estimating the costs. Other States—very few—make it plain that these specialists are not consulted about the budget. States which give a minimal role to the specialist supervisors are also likely to report that no use was made of National Science Foundation and NDEA institute participants . . . no use was made of consultants from industry or higher education . . . there were no requests for help with project planning . . . there were no publications in the special subject fields . . . there was little inservice training.

1.2 *Utilizing all the State's Educational Resources*

The specialist supervisor acts as a catalyst among the State's educational resources to bring about activities of many kinds, all of them designed to contribute ultimately to the improvement of instruction. It is demonstrated countless times in the States' annual reports that effective action resulted because there was a person in the State department of education with the time, the responsibility, the professional awareness, and the modicum of money needed to initiate action. He may be merely the initiator, or he may be the organizer, or even the director of the project. Perhaps he did little more than secure official sanction for the project. He may have named the advisory committee; he may be its chairman or its executive secretary. His role in a project may be very small, unnoticed; again he has been known to select the institutional site for a national institute, help write the proposal, teach on the faculty, help select the teachers who will attend, and even convince them that they should attend.

Idaho reports:

> The Idaho mathematics supervisor organized the Idaho Council of Teachers of Mathematics, with a first annual meeting in Boise. It was sponsored jointly by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Committee on Affiliated Groups, the Idaho Education Association, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the State department of education. Some 300 teachers attended, and over 200 became charter members of the council. The council has already begun to organize inservice training programs.

Maine:

> The science supervisor initiated a statewide inservice training program for over 2,000 elementary school teachers. The instructors were selected secondary school science teachers; the project was financed by NASA; it was directed by Maine's five State teachers colleges. The participants were about 35 percent of the elementary school teachers of the state.

Massachusetts:

> In January 1964, with title III support, the State started a program of extracurricular science instruction: Institute of Seminars for Advanced Able High School Students. It organized 24 regional centers of instruction and provided seminars for 1,600 high school juniors and seniors, with instruction given on a voluntary basis by more than 100 outstanding scientists and engineers from colleges, universities, industries, and research organizations. Plans are to continue and increase this in fiscal year 1965.

Rhode Island:

> The State Department of Education sponsors—along with State colleges and universities and industrial organizations—a Senior Academy of Science, which seeks to provide to students increased and improved experiences in science. The Rhode Island science consultant is a member of the steering committee of the Junior Academy of Science which has a similar purpose.

South Carolina:

> South Carolina Association of Biology Teachers was organized as an affiliate of the National Association of Biology Teachers during 1963 and 1964. The science supervisor was instrumental in its organization and is a member of the board of advisors. Approximately 58 teachers in this State hold membership in this organization.

Delaware:

> The science supervisor secured brochures and application materials from colleges and universities offering NSF summer institutes, and mailed them to schools and individual teachers throughout the State to stimulate participation. This effort was backed by personal contact and numerous telephone calls to both

> teachers and offering institutions to encourage the former to apply and the latter to accept the applications. Almost 15 percent of the science teachers participated in these institutes during the summer of 1963. It is considered one of the most effective activities carried out by the science supervisor.
>
> The Delaware mathematics supervisor conducted a 3-week leadership workshop in mathematics in August 1964, for seven participants: a supervising principal, one elementary teacher with a mathematics major, and five high school teachers. They designed an inservice training program for fiscal year 1965, in which the seven will serve as leaders, paid under title III. The State mathematics supervisor was instrumental in establishing sectional meetings in mathematics at both the elementary and secondary levels at the county education conventions. This extension to the elementary level was for the first time. He was also instrumental in stimulating and arranging that the convention of the Delaware Council of Teachers of Mathematics be extended from a single morning session for high school teachers, to a 2-day session for elementary schools, junior high schools and high schools, with lectures, demonstration classes and teacher panels.

Hawaii:

> The Hawaii science supervisor has worked closely with the NSF Institute program there, has surveyed the interests of teachers, conferred with Institute directors in preparation of proposals, served on selection committees, and helped evaluate the Institute programs.

Sometimes the vehicle for developing local leadership and utilizing more fully the State's educational resources is the conference; often a committee or advisory board proves effective; at times the work centers about a significant publication. Oregon reports an example of the exercise of leadership through a statewide conference:

> Our most successful inservice activity was the State Foreign Language Conference cosponsored with the Oregon Educational Association Department of Foreign Languages and the Modern Language Association. The conference has had a far-reaching effect on foreign language instruction in Oregon, not only in terms of inservice experience, but more importantly, in promoting stronger programs at the local level. Many teachers and administrators returned to their school districts with new ideas and materials which were subsequently endorsed and/or promoted with the local curriculum committees and in some cases even by local school boards. More than 500 foreign language teachers attended. The most significant result of the conference was in the area of preservice education. The keynote presentations on teacher education in foreign languages were later reprinted and distributed to all foreign language departments and deans of instruction in Oregon. This activity resulted in the State's foreign language consultant's being invited to discuss ways of improving teacher education programs at four institutions of higher learning, and contact has been established with four others.

Wisconsin used the conference technique for an unusual purpose:

> A title III State-level orientation conference was organized for all of the school administrators of the State, approximately 1,200 people.

The use of State advisory committees is increasingly widespread as a means of enlisting the help of professional people from fields other than education for the improvement of instruction in each of the subject areas supported by title III. Illinois saw in the device a means of interesting and involving college and university faculties in the problems of the public schools. The initiative came from the State supervisors.

Illinois reports:

> A request was submitted by the foreign language department to the office of the superintendent of public instruction for permission to appoint a university and college foreign language advisory committee for the State of Illinois. This request was based on indications that the foreign language consultants had not been able to avail themselves of the benefit to be derived from the institutions of higher learning in our State nor had they been able to avail themselves of the professional and academic counsel of the foreign language scholars and experts who are attached to these institutions. The appointment of such a committee would allow a clearer concept of the problems involved in foreign language teacher preparation, foreign language teacher certification, university foreign language placement, as well as allowing the universities and high schools a line of communication on mutual problems.

Idaho shows another side of the matter, but no less enthusiasm for the use of advisory committees:

> A knowledge of the size and geography of Idaho, and the difficulties of communication and travel lead to the conclusion that the proper development and utilization of State advisory committees as extensions of the State supervisor can accomplish more than any other single factor in effective supervision of title III. At the present time no funds are available to have these people meet, or to compensate them for their services.

Michigan relies heavily upon its State curriculum committees, which draw upon the professional resources of that State:

> The consultant services of the department are greatly increased by the contributions made by the State science curriculum committee appointed by the State superintendent. The members of this committee are leaders in education and the scientific community.

> Vertical representation is from elementary through graduate school levels both from education and science disciplines. Seven major public and private universities are represented as well as scientists from some of Michigan's basic industries. This committee provides a leadership pool for making curriculum studies; for communicating to both schools and industries; for programing and staffing conferences, workshops, and serving as a clearinghouse for gathering ideas useful to the schools and institutions of higher education represented.

Idaho:

> The science supervisor has established State advisory committees in all fields of science at all levels for the purpose of curriculum development, textbook evaluation, and planning for the statewide inservice program in elementary schools.

Maryland reports on an advisory committee of unusual composition and purpose:

> This State has an advisory committee composed of all the local school and regional foreign language supervisors in the State. It meets periodically during the year to share ideas and plan how the State department can be of greatest help.

Virtually all of the States with title III programs make much use of publication as a means of developing *esprit de corps* among teachers of the supported subjects and disseminating information of all kinds. In each subject field there are usually periodical "newsletters" containing items of national and local interest and designed to develop mutual respect and understanding among all levels of instruction. Illinois' report on science describes fairly well what is done in most of the participating States for all three of the subject fields supported by title III:

> Eight issues of the Illinois Science Newsletter were mailed during the year to every public school in the State. This publication, prepared by the consultants [supervisors], attempts to keep local teachers aware of the more promising new courses and curriculum studies, to suggest sources of information or teaching aids, to encourage inservice training programs, to report developments of interest to science teachers, and to inform administrators about various aspects of the title III acquisitions program.

Most of the "newsletters" go also to the schools and colleges of the State and have additional circulation in all of the other States. The total number of publications for which the supervisors are wholly or partially responsible each year—courses of study, equipment standards, bibliographies, newsletters, etc., would probably exceed 300. Most States lean heavily upon teachers who have attended NDEA, NSF, and comparable inservice education institutes in their search for local leaders. California's report typifies this attitude:

> NDEA Institute participants continue to be the key people in development and modernization of the foreign language programs in the secondary schools of the State.

Oregon:

> Extensive use is made of NDEA Foreign Language Institute trainees in all the State workshops and conferences. Skilled high school teachers are moving into positions at the community college level and we make use of these people and their colleges to promote better articulation between the secondary schools and the colleges and universities.

Louisiana's report is uncommon:

> NSF participants were not used as consultants in the science inservice program. [But] widespread use was made of NSF Institute participants for mathematics through writing projects, as inservice consultants, and for demonstration teaching.

California:

> California's science workshops have been staffed largely with persons from colleges and universities and high school teachers who have had NSF experience.

Wisconsin:

> Wisconsin mathematics supervisor served as assistant director of a statewide inservice training program supported by NSF. He also serves as chairman of Professional Improvement Committee of the Wisconsin Mathematics Council. He is also editor of the Wisconsin Teacher of Mathematics.

Idaho:

> To use NSF Institute people more effectively, the Idaho science supervisor mailed forms to all science teachers in the State to identify the potential manpower, for use in a statewide inservice training program in elementary school science.

One point stands out clearly in this particular discussion: many elementary and secondary school teachers now benefit from NDEA, NSF, and other, similar, institute or retraining programs, but they need help to apply their institute experience to their own teaching situation and to extend the area of influence of the institute to other teachers and other schools. The State supervisor in each subject area is in an excellent position to broaden the influence of the institute programs and at the same time develop leadership at the local level by using the institute participants to help conduct State inservice education programs and placing them in other positions of responsibility.

2.0 *Improving the Education of Public School Teachers*

On one theme the widely varied annual title III reports for 1964 are unanimous in their judgment: Many teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools are woefully unprepared to do the work expected of them. The vehemence and form of the reporters' statements vary; their substance is the same. The cry is equally loud for better preservice education and for continuing inservice education. A few examples should suffice to state this theme.

Connecticut reports:

> We have nowhere near the needed number of adequately prepared teachers of mathematics.

Utah:

> The thing we need most is for our experienced, competent teachers to remain in the State—and in teaching.

Ohio:

> There are not enough adequately trained and certified teachers.

Colorado:

> The most needed additions (in the title III program) are related to the improvement of inservice education for teachers. It is clear that three additional consultants, one in each subject area, could easily be absorbed.

District of Columbia:

> It is hard to attract and hold superior teachers. They are accepting better paying positions in industry and Government service.

Florida:

> Probably our greatest need is a source of financial assistance whereby inservice courses for teachers may be initiated. . . . The problem is one of finding—for example—teachers of biology who are trained or interested sufficiently to offer a laboratory-centered course. Many teachers whose main interests lie in other fields are certified in biology as a second major or as a minor. In many instances when these people are signed to teach biology they do little more than conduct "reading sessions" or provide a constant stream of films.

Texas:

> It is estimated that about 10 percent of the schools will not have fully qualified biology teachers; 20 percent will not have fully qualified chemistry teachers; and about 40 percent will not have fully qualified physics teachers for the 1964–65 school year.

Maine:

> There is a great need for more inservice training of teachers in the elementary grades.

New York:

> The largest unmet need and problem is the inservice training of teachers at all levels required to teach revised programs successfully.
>
> Judging from appeals coming from administrators for help in teacher recruitment, the demand for qualified teachers of foreign languages is as acute as ever and probably more so. Most vacancies will finally be filled, some by bringing back retired teachers, others by employing teachers who have been out of touch with the teaching profession for years, or native speakers who have language proficiency but frequently lack teaching ability or experience—all of which creates a crying need for more inservice training.
>
> If "vacancy" includes those posts in the State now filled by persons with substitute licenses, i.e., not fully qualified, there are some 2,000 vacancies in the State's secondary schools for teachers of mathematics. This is roughly one-third of all the positions.

Washington voiced the situation reported by most of the other States:

> We simply do not have science-oriented instructors teaching at the elementary level. Until our preservice programs of teacher preparation are made much more effective . . . the outstanding elementary science programs being developed at the national and regional levels will be of only token assistance.

Wisconsin reported on a survey of the preparation of foreign language teachers in 702 of its public and private schools. Seventy-five percent of the schools responded, and the findings are summarized here:

> Fifty-six percent of the modern foreign language teachers have a minor or less in the language(s) taught.
>
> Twenty-three percent have attended an NDEA foreign language institute.
>
> Fifty-one percent have traveled in a foreign country.
>
> The implication drawn from the survey is that given their inadequate preparation, well over half of the teachers must be minimal or poorer in competency. Therefore, the present programs of inservice training are not meeting the demands brought about by new

> developments in foreign language teaching methods, materials, technology, linguistics, and curricular structure.

2.1 *Strengthening the Preservice Education of Teachers*

The Washington supervisor of science gave voice to a problem which is expressed clearly in many of the State reports on title III. It is the nagging problem of improving preservice teacher education:

> There is a definite need for college instructors to become more familiar with the philosophy and contents of the modern science programs being offered in the public schools. Newly graduated teachers are not being prepared to handle courses such as PSSC, BSCS, CHEM study, CBA, ESCP, etc. This creates serious problems in science departments offering these courses . . . . Teacher certification officials are aware of shortcomings in the preservice preparation of teachers, but we are faced with a tremendous amount of pedagogical inertia.

Louisiana's report on the preparation of school teachers of modern foreign languages is no less typical:

> There is still a great need for college departments of foreign languages to bring their departments more in line with the present objectives of foreign language teaching. Far too many beginning teachers lack the oral skills for doing an effective job of teaching. It should not be necessary to send teachers, recently graduated from the colleges and universities, to institutes to be re-trained to teach the language in which they have been certified, as has often been the case.

Oklahoma:

> During the past year, we have been successful in influencing the acceleration of the foreign language program in the six State colleges which especially work in the training of teachers. These colleges have enriched their curriculum in foreign languages, added courses in methodology, and modernized their own teaching techniques . . . . We now have access to the staff of all of these colleges and are frequently consulted by them in their planning.

The difficult, delicate task of taking action to cause the State's teacher-training institutions to assess the appropriateness and adequacy of the curriculums they set for prospective teachers of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages falls in many States to the specialist supervisors. These are often the only persons who have the time, the facilities, and the knowledge necessary to initiate action at all levels of instruction. The kinds of action taken and the success—quite limited thus far—of that action is illustrated by the following cases cited in the States' reports for 1964.

Oregon:

> 1963–64 was the most successful of the three years the present consultant has worked in the department of education . . . . The greatest breakthrough was in working with the colleges and universities on the development of teacher education programs in modern foreign languages.
>
> The foreign language supervisor made a major effort to work with and influence the colleges concerned with teacher education. He worked with four Oregon universities on the development of NDEA institute proposals. College and university professors are on the regular mailing lists of the State department of education.

Wisconsin:

> The mathematics supervisor, in cooperation with the director of teacher certification, held a one-day conference in which representatives of all (26) of the colleges and universities of the State met to discuss ways by which the mathematics training of prospective elementary school teachers might be improved. The NASDTEC-AAA guidelines were used as a basis for this meeting . . . . This meeting was followed one week later with a CUPM level I meeting of the same institutions. A resolution was passed favoring the level I recommendations, and another recommending that no prospective teacher be admitted to the elementary school training program without a minimum of algebra and geometry.

Vermont's foreign language supervisor reports:

> With encouragement and recommendation from the State Advisory Committee on Modern Foreign Languages, I continued to explore the possibilities of reinstating the course on modern foreign language methodology at the University of Vermont. As a result this course was offered in the 1964–65 academic year and a professor in modern foreign language teaching methodology was engaged.

Maryland:

> Methods courses in many of the State colleges and universities are now taught by State foreign language supervisors or specialist teachers.

Maine:

> Upon the request of one of Maine's State teacher college science department chairmen, the State science supervisor made recommendations for curriculum changes pertinent to preservice education of science teachers.

Hawaii:

> The science supervisor has conferred repeatedly with the College of Education, University of Hawaii, to recommend an increase of the preservice certification requirements to 42 credits, and the introduction of

> special courses to meet the needs of teachers of science in the schools. The university is moving in the direction of the recommendations.

The Nevada report shows some of the complications of these efforts:

> An attempt is being made to bring about a reconsideration of science offerings for preservice elementary teachers at the University of Nevada. Conferences have been held with the president, the dean of arts and science, and the department chairmen of biology, chemistry, and physics as well as staff members in these departments, and with members of the staff of the College of Education. One of the goals is the establishment of a council of representatives of departments and colleges and of the practicing profession to study the education in science of all teachers . . . . Proposals are being prepared for new approaches which may be instituted during the coming academic year. In the relatively short (4 months) period during which this has been underway there is clear evidence of growing concern on the part of academic science staff members and a willingness to put forth an effort to effect changes. This is extremely encouraging . . . .

The Texas report shows the importance of cooperative planning:

> Chairmen of the department of science in the various teacher training institutions were included in the planning and instruction phase of our inservice study groups, and therefore have become very familiar with the problems of high school teachers. As a natural consequence, changes in preparation of teachers are taking place.

The point that is made and reiterated in the States' narrative reports on title III is that someone must take the lead, someone who can speak authoritatively and convincingly with "academicians," "educators," and deans, with principals, school boards, and classroom teachers.

Pennsylvania shows the catalytic action of the science supervisor:

> Under a small grant from NSF and with the cooperation of the Pennsylvania Academy of Science, we held 10 meetings in different locations for college teachers of science. Representatives from industry related the details of research on biological and physical problems. Students doing undergraduate research were asked to report. The finale of each meeting was a discussion of the implications of all this for college science teaching. The ninth meeting included science education teachers and was a working conference. This group produced written guidelines for improving the education of science teachers.

The District of Columbia:

> As a result of conferences of the D.C. mathematics supervisors with the dean of D.C. Teachers College on the subject of preservice education for mathematics teachers, there is now a 6-hour mathematics requirement for elementary schoolteachers.

Ohio:

> Conferences were held with officials of a number of teacher training institutions. Many of the Ohio institutions are offering more adequate "content courses" in mathematics on an optional rather than required basis. Enrollments in these courses are encouraging.

Alabama reports an effective way of making a point clear:

> In discussions with 25 college and university professors, suggestions were made for improving preservice education of foreign language teachers. The supervisor conducted a tour of four language laboratories in the public schools of Montgomery to help the foreign language department of one State college in the selection of laboratory equipment, and to reveal to this group the needs of prospective teachers of modern foreign languages.

2.2 *Meeting the Demand for Inservice Education*

Another point of unanimity in the States' reports on title III is the increasing demand from local school districts for programs of inservice education and the States' inability to satisfy that demand. Minnesota spoke for them all when it reported, "We could probably double our present [title III supervisory] staff and still not adequately meet all of the needs." The aim in all cases is to improve instruction, and it is plain that improvement can take place no faster than the teaching staff is prepared to undertake it. The preparation requires extensive upgrading of teachers in subject matter and teaching methods. It is in this area of their work that the specialist supervisors—compelled by virtue of the immense numbers of teacher trainees to provide more help than they could possibly give in person—have been most ingenious in extending the scope and influence of their office. It is in this area too that school administrators at both the State and local levels are unanimous regarding the need.

The Arkansas report is so typical that it speaks for them all:

> If we had more teachers and money for inservice education, we would make more progress in both quantity and quality of instruction.

The examples below are selected to show the wide range of successful practices in the States. They cover, of course, only a very small sampling of the total amount of inservice training provided through title III in the three subject areas in these and other States.

Oregon:

> Oregon provides an example of an approach to inservice education and the encouragement of professional growth among science teachers in elementary schools through its science handbook development project. Such a handbook in tentative form had been prepared by a Science Handbook Committee, and to test the feasibility of its use the science supervisor arranged and conducted some 19 inservice programs ranging in length from 2 to 30 hours. Approximately 450 teachers and administrators participated.
>
> The inservice programs oriented the teachers to the philosophy and content of the handbook and provided for teacher participation in sample activities. About 90 percent of the teachers who attended volunteered to continue using the handbook in their classes. Title III funds provided the services of the State supervisor, the expenses for monthly meetings of the Science Handbook Committee, and the printing of 500 copies of the handbook itself.
>
> Over the course of the inservice meetings it became apparent that many teachers were beginning to teach science in ways which were new to them. These included activity-centered science programs, participation by pupils in elementary research, opportunities for discovery by pupils, using measurement to substantiate knowledge, and using a variety of resources. For many teachers their science programs developed an inquiring nature as opposed to the coverage of known information.

New York:

> New York too finds ways to extend the arm of the supervisors. Forty-two centers of inservice training in mathematics for elementary science teachers were established. The instructors were first trained at a special workshop at the State College at Oswego for four weeks in the summer of 1963. The workshop for instructors was paid for by title III. The centers for elementary science teachers were supported 50 percent by title III. The service will expand to 60 inservice centers next year.

The one-to-one relationship of the effective State specialist supervisor and effective inservice education programs is emphasized in the Kentucky report:

> Our inservice workshops for teachers are the result of the persistence of one of our supervisors.

Oklahoma:

> In July 1963, an Office of Education representative and the foreign language supervisor conducted 1-day FLES workshops at four Oklahoma colleges in cooperation with the foreign language departments there, an activity which resulted in the initiation of about 20 new FLES programs in Oklahoma. Both administrators and prospective teachers attended.
>
> At the request of the Oklahoma foreign language supervisor, Oklahoma State University initiated a program of extension inservice education for foreign language teachers. The foreign language supervisor planned the course and supervised it, and designated the teacher, a strong secondary school teacher with NDEA Institute training. Ten teachers enrolled for the series of 3-hour sessions.

State and Federal funds alone do not support all of the inservice education that is provided. Other agencies are equally concerned to meet this need, as this report from Delaware indicates:

> Many of the title III acquisition projects go hand in hand with a very specific effort to improve instruction, e.g., the growth of the Biological Science Curriculum Study Program in the State. Approximately one-third of the schools instituted the BSCS last year and an additional third are committing themselves for the coming year. To support this we have developed an inservice program in modern biology with the University of Delaware. This is a two-semester course, meeting one evening per week, and enrolling about 20 percent of the secondary school science teachers of the State. The State department of education organized the program, but no other costs under title III were involved.
>
> Once the teachers have been prepared, we have encouraged school districts to acquire the equipment necessary to implement the program using title III funds. The improved program, supported by inservice programs and title III equipment funds, has appealed to many of our districts and they have been eager to take advantage of this.

The supervisors have learned that successful inservice training programs require broad, responsible involvement of persons at the local level. South Carolina reports on this point:

> We emphasize continuously that responsibility for the quality of instruction must be accepted at the local level. Many schools have accepted this challenge and stepped up their inservice activities through local self-study groups and workshops.

Alabama shows one way of achieving this:

> Every inservice group had an advisory committee composed of local teachers, principals, and supervisors. This committee assisted in planning programs, locating leaders, identifying the needs of the local groups and assisting the consultant [supervisor] wherever or whenever she needed help.

Arkansas reports another way to share the work and develop local leadership:

> The State is divided into eight districts, each with a district committee and an elected representative responsible for organizing an annual workshop. The State foreign language supervisor furnishes each

with a list of all foreign language teachers, a list of those who have attended NDEA institutes, and other helps. For the State as a whole there is an executive committee, which includes the presidents of AATF, AATSP, and of the classical and modern foreign language sections of the Arkansas Education Association, plus the eight district representatives. The State supervisor helps the district committees plan their workshops, and helps the executive committee plan and conduct two annual State meetings.

An unusual project in California shows how inservice training for language teachers was financed:

> The Union School District of Santa Clara County (Calif.) organized a summer inservice training institute in Puebla, Mexico, for its teachers of Spanish. The salaries of the consultant teachers of these teachers were paid in part from title III funds. A bond issue was passed in the Union School District for the purpose of providing this inservice training. Some 26 teachers have been given background of the language in courses paid for by the district the past two years and will continue their study of the language in the workshop in Mexico at district expense.

An exceptional project in Texas reached 32,000 teachers of mathematics:

> Another type of inservice education makes use of self-instructing materials or programed instruction. More than 32,000 elementary school teachers participated in this program in 1963–64, using materials prepared specifically for the program. The purpose is to prepare teachers for the new elementary arithmetic textbooks to be used next year in Texas.

Idaho reports on an inservice education program which shows clearly how such a program can be used to develop leadership at the local school level, and how effective such leadership can be.

> "Project Idaho" utilized strong secondary school teachers, who have had recent training in modern mathematics quite often in an NSF Institute to teach better mathematics to elementary school teachers. Last year 23 high school mathematics teachers conducted extensive inservice courses for elementary science teachers, 650 of them. Each of the 23 was appointed as a "District Mathematics Consultant." These individuals conducted inservice classes, acted as advisers to their local district regarding mathematics education, curriculum reform, and changes that might occur in the title III program. They were very effective extensions of the mathematics supervisor throughout the State. They responded readily to the requests of the supervisor to give speeches to local administrative meetings to inform them of the progress that was made in "Project Idaho" and enlist their support in the future.

Pennsylvania reports:

> We found it ineffective to expect teachers to write materials for a countywide K–12 science program without previous intensive inservice education. We now plan to train selected teachers in two special inservice centers at Edinboro State College and Washington and Jefferson College. These teachers will then conduct inservice programs during the winter term. Ultimately, we hope to organize a science advisory service in each of the regional curriculum centers. All of this is an attempt to unify and stabilize the quality of inservice education, so that it becomes less "shotgun" in its approach.

Utah reports on the need for inservice work:

> A recent status study in Utah revealed that only about 29 percent of our mathematics teachers have a college major in the field, and another 27 percent have a college minor in mathematics. This leaves 44 percent of our teachers of secondary school mathematics woefully unprepared for their teaching assignment.

At times, unusual requirements call for unusual procedures, as exemplified by this report from California:

> California brought about the organization of an NDEA Institute at Elbert Covell College with special emphasis on preparing Mexican Americans possessed of the bachelor's degree as Spanish teachers to help staff schools in complying with the Casey bill of 1961 which mandated foreign language instruction in grades 6, 7, 8, by July 1965. Satisfactory completion of the institute courses fulfills the requirements of the new "Standard Designated Subject Matter Credential" in a foreign language.

Nebraska found an unusual way to provide inservice education:

> Again this year "help-mobiles" under the sponsorship of the Nebraska State Education Association and the State department of education helped to make NSF Institute participants available for inservice training projects throughout the State. The emphasis this year was on both physical and biological science.

The Montana State supervisor for science and mathematics also uses a mobile laboratory equipped with apparatus for the two subjects as a means of providing inservice education to teachers.

The seriousness of the need for State-sponsored inservice training and the difficulty of meeting this immense need even with the full use of title III are made evident in the following cases. The facts reported are descriptive of the situation in many of the States.

Idaho reports:

> Very few of Idaho's elementary school teachers have received any inservice training under the NSF program. Most of them are women, their average age is about 45 years, they have families at home, generally with teenage children, and they also have responsibilities for helping maintain a farm. A recent

> informal survey by the State department of education showed that these teachers would not accept any NSF grant which required them to leave their homes, either during the academic year or during the summers. This means that the inservice training they do receive must be of the brief kind under local sponsorship.
>
> Generally the pattern of high school teachers is for them to graduate from college, go into teaching for a period of four or five years, then go back to school under the NSF program, receive additional training, then leave the State of Idaho to go into one of the surrounding States which have much higher salary schedules.

Wisconsin:

> An estimated 15 percent of Wisconsin's elementary and secondary school teachers of mathematics participated at least one day in an inservice program, workshop or conference sponsored in part by title III. While this represents a service which was not provided by the State agency prior to NDEA, it also points out that there is much yet to be done. Each year the supervisor has to turn down many requests for his services to schools throughout the State. A recent survey indicates that 80 percent of the school districts would like to have some form of inservice and/or consultant help next year.

"At least one day" of inservice training is not much, yet even one day of guidance, demonstration, and discussion can help teachers cope with a new textbook, become familiar with a new item of laboratory equipment, or grasp the merit of a new technique of teaching. One day, or one week, or a series of Saturday sessions can reorient a teacher in significant ways, especially with respect to the "technical" aspects of teaching: instructional materials, laboratory and other equipment, and the techniques of teaching. Such limited periods are rarely sufficient to increase significantly and sufficiently the teacher's substantive knowledge of the subject field. The supervisors' reports in the three fields—science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages—recognize this limitation. The fact of this recognition explains their intensified effort to marshal and coordinate all resources in the State, especially the institutions which train teachers, to improve both their inservice and their preservice education.

The need for inservice training programs to develop and maintain the aural-oral proficiency of teachers of modern foreign language is especially acute, according to the annual reports. At least one State, Illinois, reports some success with "oral proficiency workshops" despite the severe time limitation.

> This office [of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction] offered oral proficiency workshops in French and Spanish for eight consecutive Saturdays, 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. at the Chicago Loop Junior College. The workshops had two objectives: to assist the teacher to acquire better pronunciation habits, and to instruct the teacher in the presentation of the oral skills to students. The attendance and response were terrific. Each section had 25 participants constantly and many who attended some sessions but not all of them . . . . We tried to offer these same workshops in the East St. Louis area. They had to be canceled, lacking sufficient enrollment.

West Virginia reports another outstanding example of how, through their new cadres of specialist supervisors, States are providing inservice training that is both academically sound and substantial in amount.

> A 182-page course of eight lessons, *Mathematics for Elementary Teachers* was prepared by a writing committee of high school and college teachers of mathematics, working with an advisory committee, all under the direction of the State mathematics supervisor, also one of the writers. County school districts may apply for inservice training programs which are commonly a total of 20 hours spread over 10 weeks of meetings. The basic text, noted above, and the teacher—often a high school teacher with NSF institute training—are supplied through title III by the State.

2.2.1 *Extent of the Inservice Education Provided*

This is an extremely difficult point on which to report, since both the financial and professional support of inservice training programs may come from one or many sources differing widely from State to State and within each State. The contribution of Federal title III funds may represent any portion of the costs;[2] the professional contribution from title III supervisory and related services personnel may be large or small. The basic criterion for inclusion of an inservice training project in the title III annual report is that it be *arranged* or *conducted* by the State's title III specialist supervisors.

Much information on the procedures and kinds of inservice education was given above under "2.2 Meeting the Demand for Inservice Education." The following reports do not cover all of the States. The illustrative data given here represent the best judgment of competent professional people working closely with the schools. It is not feasible to report data from all the States, but the examples here given are typical.

---

[2] Normally, title III supervisory and related services are supported by Federal and State funds on a matching basis. The laws of some States make it possible for local as well as State funds to be used to match Federal funds.

New Jersey reports:

> Similar to last year, it is estimated that about 25 percent of the secondary school science teachers participated in conferences or inservice programs sponsored by our office. Probably less than 1 percent of the elementary school teachers were involved in these programs.

Hawaii:

> About 5–10 percent of the elementary science teachers and 30–40 percent of the secondary teachers have received substantial inservice training.

Missouri:

> Approximately 2 percent of Missouri's elementary teachers and 3.5 percent of the secondary teachers participated in sequential title III workshops during the 1963–64 academic year.

Kansas:

> The foreign language supervisor served on a half-time basis. He organized and conducted 11 drive-in conferences for administrators and teachers on the planning and utilization of the language laboratory. They were attended by 10 percent of the State's foreign language teachers and 5 percent of the administrators.

Oklahoma:

> In fiscal year 1963, 20 percent of the elementary school teachers and 50 percent of the high school teachers of mathematics had participated in mathematics inservice training programs of mathematics institutes. These percentages increased in fiscal year 1964 to 75 percent and 80 percent respectively.
>
> About 50 percent of the elementary school teachers and 10 percent of the high school teachers of science have had some inservice training in that field.

South Carolina:

> Approximately 3,600 teachers have been involved in inservice programs conducted and/or planned by the mathematics supervisor. About 1,000 of them attended from 3 to 12 sessions of 1 to 2 hours duration each.

Massachusetts:

> Science teachers who have received substantial inservice training: Elementary—15 percent; secondary—60 percent. But there are about 150 new science teachers employed each year in Massachusets, and the number of vacancies increases.

Utah reports an unusual project for an unusual purpose:

> The mathematics supervisor arranged for an "Advanced Placement Mathematics Workshop" during June 1964 and conducted a portion of each day's session. It was supported by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, Ford Foundation. The purpose was to train teachers for this work and prepare a syllabus for advanced placement mathematics.

Louisiana:

> Approximately 90 percent of the secondary teachers and 80 percent of the elementary school teachers participated in mathematics workshops and conferences sponsored by the Louisiana State Department of Education during 1963–64. But only 1 percent of the elementary science and 5 percent of the high school teachers attended institutes.

Nevada reports a special difficulty of large, sparsely populated States:

> A major problem in Nevada is the difficulty of providing inservice training in the small, outlying schools. A 10-session, 34-hour workshop in any one of them would consume a third of the travel budget for the year.

West Virginia reported some facts about the cost of such training:

> Seventy-four separate courses, each consisting of ten 2-hour sessions of instruction in "modern" mathematics for elementary school teachers, were conducted in fiscal year 1964. Each of 2,552 teachers had 20 hours of intensive instruction in groups ranging from 15 to 55 persons. The work was supported by title III at a total cost of $5,565.43 (cost of text materials not included), providing approximately 51,040 hours of instruction at about $0.11 per teacher per hour. This work covered 17 of the State's 55 counties.

The picture is a confusing one and present data-gathering procedures in the States make it impossible to summarize the separate statements and give a national overview. The terms "inservice education" and "inservice workshop" embrace many kinds of training projects ranging from the single half-day session to the full-time 6-week institute. There is variation in the extent of teacher participation: Sometimes the participants receive orientation from lectures, sometimes they see demonstrations, sometimes they are deeply involved in extended study and practice. The desperately felt need for inservice education and the possibility of the States' giving heavy support to this activity through title III, NDEA, are relatively new facts in our educational life. The States are still groping for ways to extend as far as possible the influence of their supervisors, and inservice education is the major activity.

The title III administrator in Delaware has summed up the nationwide conviction:

> **Superior or promising programs in mathematics in Delaware have not resulted so much from the expenditure of acquisition funds (where only a small percentage goes into mathematics) as from the use of the supervisory and related services funds in establishing inservice activity and stimulation. It is the latter that has probably established a trend in Delaware and an awareness so that most Delaware schools will move as rapidly as teachers are prepared to the recent trends in mathematics education in the elementary schools.**

3.0 *Stimulating Curriculum Revision*

Of all the elements which combine to make a school—i.e., a situation especially favorable to the education of children—the one most subject to constant pressures toward change and perhaps least amenable to smooth, easy coordination is the curriculum. The complexity arises in part from the long tradition of autonomy characterizing in some measure all parts of our educational system: In some degree each school system, State or local, each college or university, each of the separate levels of instruction, even each building, is a kingdom; and within, every teacher, professor, and chief administrator, a law unto himself. In part the complexity comes from factors such as reaching for the ideal of educating all children, rather than simply those most easily educated, and from extreme geographic mobility of our school population.

Other complicating factors are more directly the concern of the supervisor, the professional subject matter specialist in State departments of education. One of these is the continuing need to incorporate in the curriculum the constant accumulation of new knowledge in each field, and the techniques of teaching which correspond to that expansion of knowledge and consequent changing educational policies.

Another, even more difficult task, is to achieve maximum continuity and articulation from one grade level to the next and among the three school levels: elementary, secondary, and college. This involves planning new courses of study, rethinking and rewriting curriculum guides, and the selection of more appropriate instructional materials. Above all, it requires that for each subject area the teaching staffs and administrators in each separate subject area from all of the educational levels—elementary, junior high, senior high, and college—meet and agree that they have problems in common, and solve them on the basis of mutual respect and understanding. This interlevel or vertical coordination—a relatively new departure in American education—cannot be accomplished satisfactorily at the statewide level alone: Before the change can make itself felt as improved instruction, there must be mutual understanding and respect and vertical coordination between the faculties of every school or college and the "feeder schools" from which most of its students come.

A report from Washington is typical of this new awareness:

> In all workshops, conferences, etc., it is planned that the high school served by each community college and the appropriate personnel in the higher institutions will be involved, together with resource people from the State Office of Public Instruction.

This enormous work of both educational statesmanship and educational craftsmanship is shared by many persons in some State departments of education. In others it falls largely upon the subject matter supervisors, the persons whose competence at all levels of learning enables them to speak authoritatively to their colleagues at all levels.

The examples below, selected from the States' 1964 annual reports on title III, suggest several different approaches to curriculum revision, and show the deep involvement of the specialist supervisors in this work.

Wisconsin, Ohio, California, and the District of Columbia show varied ways to encourage vertical coordination:

Wisconsin:

> The foreign language supervisor worked all year with a statewide curriculum committee consisting of elementary, secondary, and college teachers of foreign languages. The intent of the committee is to produce a basic philosophy of language instruction which will serve as a guide in setting up and expanding foreign language programs in Wisconsin. It has not been easy to get people to agree on the most fundamental aspects of the guide. Progress, therefore, is rather slow.

Ohio:

> The supervisor worked to establish foreign language committees in State chapters of our AAT groups and met with them to produce guidelines for foreign language instruction. Committees are composed of college, secondary, and elementary teachers. The purpose is to work toward some uniformity in foreign language programs and better articulation between the various levels of instruction.

California:

> It is a common pattern in California counties and school districts to organize a "foreign language council," comprised of school personnel, parents, and representatives of lay groups and agencies in the community. The State foreign language supervisor is instrumental in bringing the organization into being and keeping it oriented toward effective action. California has also used its foreign language supervisors to orient school boards to language teaching problems: The county school board would invite school boards of all districts throughout the county to joint meetings.

A State-level advisory group in California, the "Liaison Committee on Foreign Language," also typifies the effort to coordinate vertically by bringing about a meeting of minds from the different educational levels. Its 24 members are chosen, 6 each from the secondary schools, the junior colleges, the colleges, and the University of California. The committee is concerned with articulation, placement, preservice training, and the dissemination of information.

District of Columbia:

> The Joint Board on Science Education sponsored a series of "area conferences" in each of the sciences during the year. The science supervisor helped plan these conferences with scientists of the area. They dealt with new curriculum development, methods of teaching, and use of equipment to improve learning. Some 12 conferences were held; average attendance, nearly 100. The joint board also provides advisors on science fair project work, and inservice workshop programs.

South Dakota reports on the problem of local autonomy:

> Boards of education in many of these small enrollment districts are compelled to follow the inclinations of the teachers and the superintendents in developing a program, which is inconsistent and ineffective other than meeting the State requirements for graduation. Local school requirements for graduation are often developed after the staff has been selected and the teaching certificates studied . . . .

Oregon reports on the increasing concern in local school districts for curriculum revision. Typically the report mentions the increase in specialist supervisory staff at the local level:

> The increase in the number of active mathematics curriculum and coordinating committees in local districts is further evidence of attempts by local districts to improve instruction through planning, improved articulation, and dissemination of information about new developments. Several school districts have also added mathematics consultants or supervisors to their staffs . . . .

Even more often, the practice is to combine curriculum revision with inservice training sessions in order to benefit from many teachers' experience and, thereafter, to give them direct experience with the revised materials.

Oklahoma reports:

> Oklahoma has prepared a revised "Guide to the Improvement of the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages" and circulated it in draft to all Oklahoma foreign language teachers. Then they held nine 1-day workshops at the colleges where a total of 316 teachers met to discuss and criticize the "Guide." Also it was revised again and printed. The State foreign language supervisor selected the original writing committee and worked with it. Title III supported the project. The writers were from all sectors and levels.

Colorado:

> Title III funds have helped support a Saturday field biology course for high ability high school students at Wasson High School, a BSCS biology course for high-ability junior high students, and associated workshops for the teachers of these courses.

The introductory paragraph of this section on curriculum revision stressed the need for mutual respect and understanding if there is to be vertical coordination of curriculum and instruction from level to level in the schools and colleges. One of the most promising signs of this mutuality is the increasing number of reports that the State supervisors, oriented primarily to instruction in the schools, are called upon by the colleges for assistance.

Illinois reports one example among many that might be cited:

> Various colleges and universities consulted the State supervisors about the organization and selection of materials for summer workshops in mathematics: Eastern Illinois University, Illinois Normal University, Carthage College, Rockford College, Aurora College, Blackburn College, Felician College, Blackhawk Junior College in Rock Island.

This example from Alabama is no less revealing:

> The title III science consultants [supervisors] worked closely with the supervisors of the State department of education, secondary division, in curriculum development not only for junior and senior high schools but also in setting up a sequence of science courses for 11 new colleges and trade schools to be established in Alabama in the near future.

We saw in the section of this report entitled "Strengthening the Preservice Education of Teachers" that in Oregon the supervisor of modern foreign languages has been working with four of the State's universities. All of the institutions of higher learning in Wisconsin have joined with the State mathematics supervisor to discuss the mathematics training of prospective elementary school teachers; the Wisconsin modern language supervisor has served as adviser on the teacher training curriculum of one State university. Similar evidences of cooperation could be cited in the other States.

4.0 *Encouraging Research and Demonstration Projects*

The specialist supervisor's leadership role extends to include the dissemination of research findings which have implications for the improvement of instruction, and the encouragement of experimental or pilot projects in the schools to use, demonstrate, and evaluate the findings of research. One State, Michigan, provides in its State plan for up to 100 percent support of such research and demonstration through title III. The amount of direct support varies greatly from State to State; the constant is encouragement and guidance from the supervisor. Only a few examples of this activity can be reported here.

Vermont reports:

> **As a preliminary to undertaking serious experimentation in modern foreign language teaching, eight secondary schools were designated by the State supervisor as demonstration centers. The centers agree to receive teacher visitors, who observe regular classes. A special discussion period for guests and host-teachers and administrators follows each daily session. The project has also been a stimulus to curriculum revision and "professional leave" for teachers.**

Utah:

> **A series of 64 MPATI science films for grades 3 and 4 entitled "Science Corner" and 64 for grades 5 and 6 entitled "Exploring Science" were used by approximately 75 schools. Fifteen of the fifth grade classes took part in a formal study to determine the most effective ways for utilizing ETV in the teaching of science. A report of the project will be made available from Dr. Helmut Hofmann of Utah State University. The science specialist did much of the "legwork" in getting the study started. He was advisor and TV inservice teacher during the eight months the study was in progress.**

Florida:

> **The science supervisor has been involved in the planning and implementation of what is called the "Motivation and Depth Program," now underway and directed by Dr. Milton Saslaw, director of research at the National Childrens Cardiac Hospital in Miami with support from NSF. A controlled experiment has placed 40 selected eighth graders in a study program involving BSCS biology the first year, followed by CHEM chemistry the next year, PSSC physics the third year, and a laboratory research program during the junior and senior high school years. Title III funds support the evaluation portion of the project.**

Michigan:

> **Michigan has four experimental computer programs in its secondary schools. For each program a study committee was developed to guide the work: local school personnel, administrators and teachers, board of education representatives, experienced lay persons, and a title III staff member. The tremendous advance in science and mathematics problem solving ability of the computer will permit a greater compatibility between advanced science problems and complicated mathematics involved in their solutions. The computer-based programs are designed to develop understanding of the basic structure of mathematics, and stimulate some students to do advanced study in the field of mathematics, and research with the computer. It is also hoped that the programs will provide enrichment courses such as symbolic logic and theory of number systems (sic). Each committee makes a review of the program annually, with a view to making recommendations for its modification or continuation.**

Idaho:

> **The science supervisor is responsible for supervising experimental programs established under the State Textbook Commission. Idaho has a 5-year textbook adoption cycle. The title III science supervisors have been influential in having the law modified to include a 2-year clause and an experimental clause. Under the former, publishers may submit textbooks for consideration for two years after the regular adoption cycle. Under the latter, schools may purchase any materials of an experimental nature for use in their school, with prior permission of the science supervisor. They must make periodic reports to the supervisor regarding their findings on these experimental materials. One of the programs established under the experimental clause is the PSSC physics course. The experimental clause is equally effective in the field of mathematics.**

The need for overall coordination of these efforts within the States' borders and beyond is suggested by this statement in the report from Iowa:

> **Without proper guidance, local districts sometimes become involved in experiments and/or projects that have previously been explored and evaluated. Such information should be shared with other schools.**

An especially significant experiment in bilingual education initiated and supported in part through title III is underway in the Merced (Calif.) public schools, where special instruction in and through the Spanish language is provided for the large number of native speakers of that language in Tenaya Intermediate School. The project began in the 1962–63 school year with the Tenaya eighth graders and in the next year was extended to include pupils in the seventh grade.

Wisconsin speaks of "exciting new programs":

> **Kaukauna has initiated an industrial science course which requires advanced applied mathematics for those intending to enter schools of engineering. The Monona Grove High School science department has undertaken an extensive experimental program which purports to develop a 4-year integrated science course which will not recognize the accepted classification of scientific knowledge. The biology department of the Wausau High School has continued with its team teaching project and is putting new emphasis on the use of closed circuit television.**

New Mexico:

> **1963–64 was New Mexico's second year of participation in the Ford Foundation's Small Schools Project. Participating schools experimented with programed instruction, sometimes used in simultaneous multiple-class situations, and other ways of strengthening mathematics programs in grades 1–12. The State supervisor frequently consulted with school staff members, boards of education, and parents on problems of placement, morale, testing, and "earned credit."**

A few examples of experimental programs suggest the extent to which the best high schools of today are offering instruction once limited to the colleges.

Washington:

> **A promising program of investigations in nuclear science is offered at Curtis High School in Tacoma. The instructor has designed instruments essential to quantitative studies and has devised a series of suggested investigations of the characteristics and potential uses of radioisotopes and atomic energy. We hope to encourage the use of this material through a series of workshops, with former participants of NSF Radiation Biology Institutes and AEC Institutes serving as instructors. Title III funds and State matching money have financed the development, publication, and distribution of the new materials.**

Minnesota:

> **There is a promising program in computer education at Hopkins. As a direct result of the spring conference of the Minnesota Council of Teachers of Mathematics where computers were displayed and used in section meetings, this school purchased a G–15 computer under title III.**

Pennsylvania:

> **The first section of a course outline on "Great Problems in Science" has been published. The course poses a series of problems (insecticides, water conservation, population explosion) to students and offers a reading list. The problems originate from science and technology, but have social, moral, political, and economic implications. The students are encouraged to debate, write about, and reflect on the problems in a classroom atmosphere of free inquiry.**

New Hampshire:

> **At Hanover High School in cooperation with the University of New Hampshire an advanced placement experimental mathematics course carrying 6 hours of university credit is being taught to some 18 seniors. Two teachers work together, "team-teaching" the course, which lends excitement to this cooperative effort between schools and colleges. Title III funds purchase supplementary and reference materials.**

5.0 *Evaluation of the Title III Program in Fiscal Year 1964*

Title III provides financial assistance for strengthening instruction in the critical subjects which it supports, and official regulations require that provision be made in every State's title III plan for annual review and evaluation of the effectiveness of the State's title III program. Each State must answer the question, "Has instruction in these subjects been strengthened?"

There are at least two ways of approaching the task of evaluating an educational program which, like title III NDEA, focuses upon the improvement of instruction in the classroom. Theoretically and ideally, one might wish to measure quantitatively, by the use of achievement and other tests, the effect of the instruction upon the child—in terms of his understanding, knowledge of fact, mastery of skills, and changes of attitude. In their attempts to evaluate the effect of title III, the State coordinators of title III have not overlooked such quantitative measurement of student achievement, etc., but they have been very reluctant to attribute to title III alone and directly all the changes and improvements which can have resulted only from a complex of factors, one of which is title III. Furthermore, the difficulty and expense of large-scale administration of achievement tests—supposing these instruments to be available and adequate—are strong deterrents to this approach.

The other approach to evaluation stops short of attempting to measure pupil achievement and instead evaluates the circumstances which affect learning: the physical setting in classroom or laboratory, the materials and equipment of instruction, the qualifications of the teacher, size of the class, motivating factors, etc. It is on this second, more general approach, that State coordinators have usually and necessarily relied in attempting to evaluate title III.

The title III administrator in Kansas expressed it typically in this way:

> Evaluation has to be measured by what is happening to students in the classroom. Although there is no guarantee that good facilities, equipment, and materials automatically improve instruction, it is certain that this cannot take place, even with excellent teachers, unless these are available.

The administrator in Delaware elaborated on this point:

> Obviously, not every child resident and enrolled in a district is affected directly by the title III program, but he is in an environment where this program will touch him sooner or later, either because of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, or because the assistance granted to those programs has in turn allowed the school district to be more generous with its own funds in the enhancing of other instructional programs.

The States have attempted to evaluate the effect of title III on their public schools in many ways and have reported data of many kinds. These data covering principal points will be summarized here.

5.1 *Extent of Participation in the Title III Program*

This kind of evidence is found in the following sampling of reports on participation.

Florida reports:

> The effectiveness of the title III program in the improvement of instruction is evident in that every county in the State is participating in the program. Requests for consultant's services in each area continue to exceed the ability of the department to meet them.

Rhode Island:

> The degree of participation is an indication of the program's effectiveness. All school systems in the State have submitted projects under title III. In-service workshops under title III are requested by both administrators and teachers to such an extent that waiting lists have had to be established.

South Carolina:

> At the close of the 1964 fiscal year only 2 districts out of a total of 109 had not submitted a local plan to participate in the title III program. Only a few districts failed to send one or more projects for approval.

Alabama:

> A study of project applications reveals that all 67 county systems and 48 of the 50 city systems have sub-

> mitted project applications for acquisition of equipment and materials or minor remodeling.

New Mexico:

> Of 91 administrative units, only 3 small units have not participated in the title III program at one time or another.

Some States, in order to encourage consolidation or for other reasons, make it difficult for very small schools to participate in the title III program. North Dakota is an example of those States which do not penalize their small schools by making them ineligible to benefit under title III. A number of one- and two-room elementary schools in North Dakota participate in the program.

It has taken time for each State's department of education to assure itself and its constituent local school districts that any Federal control of education—prohibited by the NDEA itself—is made impossible by the very nature of the act, which in fact places the burden of all decision making upon each State and its local schools. Within a number of participating States there is still a residue of hesitation and unwillingness to accept this particular Federal aid.

Indiana reports on this point:

> Most school people are realizing that benefits can be obtained by participating in the title III program without any danger of "Federal control." Resistance throughout the State is gradually lessening.

Idaho's report gives a fair summary of this attitude:

> . . . the general public has a mixed reaction toward the title III programs: Some feel that the program is good for the public schools, while others, who have aversion to the use of Federal funds in public education systems, speak unkindly of the program. So far as teachers, supervisors, and school administrators are concerned, a very high percentage of them have expressed appreciation for what the title III funds have done for them in the improvement of instruction in their respective schools. On the other hand, we have a very small percentage of school systems who do not participate in the title III program and whose administration has expressed strong resistance to the use of such funds in their schools.

Louisiana:

> With the exception of about 10 school systems, title III has been very well received in the State . . . . School people, as a whole, feel that the program is a worthwhile one. The general public feels the same with the exception of certain areas of the State.

5.2 *Extent of the Use of Updated Teaching Materials*

Another clear criterion of excellence of the complex of circumstances which affect learning is the use of the best possible teaching materials. This is not simply a matter of deciding to use a better textbook. The complicating factors number at least five:

1. New educational policy (e.g., emphasizing the four foreign language skills instead of concentrating on the reading skill)
2. New educational methods (e.g., learning science through pupil experimentation and "discovery" rather than by reading books and watching the teacher)
3. New subject content (e.g., "set" theory and practice in elementary school mathematics)
4. New equipment and auxiliary materials (e.g., the foreign language laboratory)
5. New curriculums (e.g., PSSC physics)

Since one of the major tasks of the title III specialist supervisor in each field is to encourage and facilitate constant curriculum study and revision, and another is to arrange inservice education programs to prepare teachers to cope with that curriculum and the instructional materials it requires, the title III coordinators view the widespread use of upgraded materials as one evidence of the effectiveness of title III. This is necessarily true since the title III acquisitions program makes available instructional materials under the advantageous condition of half of their cost being borne by Federal funds. Teaching materials of all kinds—including both antedated and the best upgraded kinds—are available through title III. Generally speaking the local school and its teachers decide what is to be acquired. The State-level specialist supervisor works hard in many ways to influence that decision.

North Carolina reports:

> Although the addition of new courses such as PSSC, BSCS, CHEM Study and CBA is not necessarily "specific evidence" of improved instruction within the schools of the State, there are 36 schools in North Carolina using PSSC physics, 5 schools using BSCS, 1 school using CHEM Study chemistry and 1 school using CBA chemistry.

Massachusetts:

> Proportion of teachers who are making adequate use of instructional materials of the modern variety:

	Elementary school, percent	*High school, percent*
Science	25	80
Mathematics	25	45

Connecticut:

Twenty-five percent of the elementary teachers and more than 50 percent of the secondary teachers of science have been substantially influenced by the availability of modern instructional materials. We have no data for assessing the adequacy of use.

Illinois:

Over 60 percent of the elementary schools of the State have updated or are in the process of updating their programs. Many of these schools have sought the help of this office in evaluating the newer programs. Hours for certification of mathematics teachers on the high school level has risen from 16 to 20.

New Mexico:

About 35 to 40 percent of New Mexico teachers are employing newer methods and techniques as well as updated teaching materials due to NDEA.

West Virginia:

All schools offering programs in PSSC, CBA, CHEM Study, BSCS, and specialized junior high science have been able to do so because of NDEA funds.

Minnesota:

The strongest evidence indicating the upgrading of science is the adoption of the new NSF courses of study. Approximately 20 percent of Minnesota districts presently teach BSCS, 10 percent PSSC, and 10 percent CHEM Study. The majority of remaining schools are also considering the new courses.

New Jersey:

From data summarized from the NDEA application forms, the following has been noted:

1. **Fifty-five schools or 27 percent of the districts sampled were teaching BSCS.**
2. **Eighty-three districts or 41 percent were teaching PSSC.**
3. **Thirty-seven districts or 18 percent teach CHEM Study or CBA.**

The number of earth science courses has increased from 12 in 1955–57 to 88 in 1962–63 and approximately 218 in 1963–64.

Hawaii:

Estimated percentages of teachers using "updated" materials: elementary school—40 percent; secondary school—30 percent. Since NDEA began here, there are 8 schools using PSSC, 15 using CHEMS, and 16 using BSCS.

Sometimes in their reports the specialist supervisors are able to give some indication of the extent of the introduction of specific curriculums and courses since the inception of NDEA. A sampling of these indications follows:

Texas:

About 20 percent of the public schools are teaching PSSC studies, 5 percent are teaching BSCS biology, and about six public schools are offering CHEM Study chemistry.

Iowa:

Use of newer science courses:

CBA chemistry—16 schools
Chemistry Study Group—8 schools
BSCS biology—45 schools
PSSC physics—39 schools
Other new programs—4 schools

Alabama:

Prior to NDEA, the science programs were left in the hands of the individual teachers; consequently, the programs were haphazard or disorganized. This situation is now changing. Many schools have developed programs for the entire elementary division. Teachers continue to help build programs, to examine, evaluate, and revise.

Maryland:

Increase in "new science course" enrollments:

	By June 30, 1963	*By June 30, 1964*	*Increase*	*Percent*
BSCS	**1,409**	**3,400**	**1,991**	**140.0**
CHEM	**178**	**572**	**394**	**210.0**
Earth science	**3,661**	**4,742**	**1,081**	**29.5**
PSSC	**919**	**1,667**	**748**	**81.0**

New York:

250 schools—grade 12: Combined advanced algebra, solid geometry, calculus, and modern mathematics
12 schools—grade 12: Probability and statistics
1 school—grade 12: Matrix algebra
5 schools—grade 12: Introduction to college mathematics
5 schools—grade 12: Foundations of advanced mathematics
100 schools—grade 12: Advanced placement calculus and analytic geometry

5.3 *Adequacy of Laboratory and Classroom Equipment*

Without adequate laboratory and classroom equipment the pupils of even the best qualified teacher are at a disadvantage: Science classes are textbook centered; the pupils read about science and memorize "facts," but miss the fundamental firsthand experience of being scientists which comes only from frequent participation in open-ended scientific experimentation. In mathematics classes an already abstract subject is made unnecessarily difficult for both pupil and teacher by the lack of models which can be manipulated, charts that facilitate classwork, and proper instruments. Foreign language students without frequent access to recorded drill materials find it unnecessarily difficult to understand and speak the new tongue.

Since the title III acquisitions program makes available to local schools laboratory and classroom equipment of many kinds with half of the cost paid from Federal funds, it is understandable that the adequacy of the schools' laboratory and classroom equipment should be a major criterion for judging the effectiveness of a State's title III program.

It is considered a fair criterion of the program's effectiveness; it is also a means of estimating how much remains yet to be done.

New York reports on the adequacy of its schools' equipment for teaching the sciences:

Grade:	*Percent of schools equipped*	*Of these, the percent of adequacy*
K–4	0–5	100
5–6	10–20	50
7–8	70	50
9 (general science)	85	50
9–11 (biology, earth science)	80	60
10–12 (chemistry-physics)	95	75

Connecticut:

> Except for a relatively small amount of remodeling, title III has had little effect on science laboratory facilities in Connecticut since the funds available are insufficient to support the purchase of laboratory furniture for new buildings.

Colorado:

> Title III has had a very desirable effect upon . . . the area of science throughout the State . . . . The adequacy of laboratory facilities has increased quite dramatically. Most secondary schools had laboratory facilities prior to title III, but in a great number of cases, particularly in the smaller schools, these facilities were woefully inadequate.

Texas:

> The title III program has been responsible for about a 65-percent increase in equipment available to students of science.

Washington:

> Science students in many Washington high schools are becoming actively involved in dynamic programs which make them actual investigators of scientific principles and phenomena under the supervision of instructors who are becoming directors rather than demonstrators. Title III funds have assisted greatly in acquiring the comparatively expensive laboratory equipment essential to such a meaningful laboratory program.

Indiana:

> In science, there are laboratory facilities in about 1 percent of the elementary schools, in somewhat over 5 percent of the junior high schools, and in 100 percent of the senior high schools.

Massachusetts:

> Adequate science laboratory facilities: 10 percent of the elementary schools, 75 percent of the high schools.

Idaho:

> In the public secondary schools in the State, approximately 20 percent to 25 percent have science laboratory facilities which the science supervisor considers to be adequate. . . . The effect of title III on science laboratory facilities within the State has been almost phenomenal. Prior to title III practically no schools within Idaho had anything that could be considered as an adequate science laboratory.

Alaska:

> It is estimated that 40 percent of the public elementary and secondary schools of the State have science laboratory equipment and it is further estimated that 60 percent of this group have adequate laboratory facilities. None of the schools have abundant facilities. The major struggle was to acquire minimum basic equipment and materials.

The Minnesota report voiced widely held misgivings about the criterion of adequacy:

> In the senior high 63 percent of the schools claimed adequate facilities. . . . "Adequate for what?" is a justifiable question. Adequate for an outmoded curriculum is probably closer to the truth than adequate for meeting present and future needs.

The Nevada report elaborated on this point:

> The "adequacy" of a laboratory depends on the philosophy of education of the instructor. There are very few examples where the facility imposes serious limitations upon the existing program. There are just as few facilities which are adaptable to team teaching, discovery or inquiry learning, and interdisciplinary or concept development courses. Presumably the demand and the capability will develop together.

South Dakota reports on the question of adequacy:

> The number of adequately equipped mathematics laboratories depends on the views of the person determining the adequacy. I believe that the adequacy must be based upon a knowledge of the community, the financial condition of the school district, and whether the graduates from that particular district will seek employment or go to college after graduation.

It should be borne in mind that the reported judgment regarding adequacy is made in most cases by the State's specialist supervisor, the person who is best qualified by experience and by virtue of his direct, personal knowledge of the laboratories to make the judgment. The Missouri science supervisor expresses a widely held concern for science teaching in the elementary schools:

> Although perhaps 90 percent of the elementary and secondary schools have some laboratory equipment, virtually none of the elementary schools are adequately equipped for the type of activities encouraged by the supervisors.

Pennsylvania:

> Many schools five years ago had no equipment at all at the elementary level. Today, a large number of our schools are setting up at least one period per week for laboratory work.

Alabama:

> Before title III Alabama had no laboratory facilities for teaching elementary science. Only textbooks and limited reference materials were available. Now the majority of schools have at least limited facilities.

Kentucky:

> About 20 percent of the upper elementary (seventh and eighth) grades have science laboratories at the present time and this percentage is increasing each year. If it had not been for the help of NDEA, title III, this would have been impossible in this State.
>
> A definite trend is noted in more laboratory work for the students [of science] and less lecturing and demonstrating by the teacher. Since individual participation in all science classes is constantly being stressed at the State level, more laboratories are being remodeled to fulfill this need. The laboratories and equipment in every school are evaluated each year either by a science supervisor or general supervisor. If deficiencies exist, a written report is returned to the local superintendent and the principal. Most of the districts are correcting those deficiencies as their finances will permit. Each year improvement in the use of laboratory facilities is noted.

Ohio:

> Practically all secondary schools have science laboratory facilities, and 90 percent of these might be considered adequate. About 25 percent of the elementary schools have such facilities and not more than 5 percent of these could be considered adequate.

California:

> From 1958 to 1963 the amount of time devoted to student laboratory work in senior high school sciences increased about 50 percent in California schools.

The above reports on science laboratories reflect teaching problems which are not unlike those faced by the foreign language instructor. In this field the basic criterion of adequacy—apart from the technical quality of the equipment per se—is ready availability of sufficient equipment to provide every foreign language student (at the high school and junior high school levels) with at least 20 minutes of drill per day. Thus, the judgments expressed below refer more to the amount and ready availability of the equipment than to its technical adequacy.

Ohio reports:

> Of some 300 foreign language laboratory installations, only 20 schools are adequately equipped.

Rhode Island:

> About 40 percent of the secondary schools have adequate foreign language laboratories.

North Carolina:

> About 20 percent of the schools have adequate foreign language laboratories.

Virginia:

> It is estimated that 30 percent of the public secondary schools possess language laboratories that provide for frequent practice for the modern language students.

Nebraska:

> An estimate of the number of secondary schools with adequate language laboratory facilities is 5 percent. These schools, however, are the larger schools in the State and enroll a sizable portion of the students in the State.

New Hampshire:

> About 66 percent of the high schools have a language laboratory, and approximately 50 percent of these laboratories are adequate for the present.

Second only after the competence of the teacher as a criterion of the excellence of a program of foreign language instruction is the length of the sequence of courses. Before NDEA, rare was the public school that offered more than two years of instruction in a language. Therefore, the State foreign language supervisors have given constant encouragement to the establishment of 4-, 5-, 6-year and even longer courses of study. The long sequence is built only by adding a level each succeeding year; hence the process is slow and the numbers still small. The report of States that furnished data on this point is recorded here.

5.4 *Longer Sequences of Foreign Language Study*

The few examples given below are merely illustrative of the trend in recent years. The incompatibility of much of the data make it impossible to show the situation nationwide.

[The figures for each State represent the number of schools reported]

Length in years	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Arkansas	10	1	5	1	------	2	------
Connecticut	[1]60	------	[1]5	------	------	------	------
Delaware	------	9	6	3	------	------	------
Indiana	25	------	16	------	------	------	------
Iowa	40	------	4	------	------	------	------
Maine	24	------	8	------	------	------	------
Missouri	15	6	2	------	------	------	------
Nebraska	42	------	------	------	------	------	------
New Hampshire	------	------	6	------	------	------	------
New Jersey	------	------	6	------	------	------	2
New Mexico	------	------	2	------	------	------	------
Oklahoma	5	------	17	------	------	------	------
Pennsylvania	[2]95	------	13	------	------	------	------
Rhode Island	10	------	5	1	1	2	2
South Carolina	9	------	4	------	------	------	------
Tennessee	25	------	9	------	------	------	------
Virginia	[2]50	------	1	------	------	------	------
Wisconsin	------	------	37	------	------	------	------

[1] Out of a total of 128 senior high schools.

[2] Percent.

5.5 *Evidence of Greater Scholastic Achievement*

Ultimately the question must be asked, "What is the effect of all this on the pupils themselves?" The answer, however elusive, seems to be that the pupils are achieving more, learning more than before NDEA simply because they are in circumstances more favorable to learning: teachers who have received extra training and who have supervisory help, upgraded instructional materials functioning in curriculums undergoing constant revision, better equipped classrooms and laboratories, advanced level courses never offered before, and longer sequences of study. These and countless other variable factors combine to make it impossible to establish a direct cause-and-effect relationship between a given pupil's scores and title III. This accounts for the reticence of the title III administrators to claim such a relationship.

Oklahoma reports:

> **The most reliable gauge of which I know that indicates improved instruction in mathematics in recent years is the testimony from our colleges and universities. Just a few years ago, considerable criticism was heard from these colleges concerning the necessity for remedial mathematics courses in the colleges. We are now told many students are admitted to advanced classes in mathematics because their high school training is thorough.**

Ohio:

> **Ohio State University recently announced that remedial mathematics courses were being discontinued due to the fact that "most of the students now entering the university are adequately prepared."**

Delaware:

> **All public school pupils who placed in the AATF contest this spring in categories A and B, which included pupils without foreign experience, were from schools with full laboratory facilities, highly qualified teachers, and a 5- or 6-year sequence of French study.**

Iowa:

> **The two State universities in Iowa, Iowa State University at Ames, and the State University of Iowa at Iowa City, have reported that new students entering in recent years are stronger. This is evidenced by the entrance tests and ability to cope with college academic standards.**

Rhode Island:

> **Mathematics grades were higher on college entrance examinations than in previous years.**

Idaho:

> **. . there appears to be universal agreement among [Idaho] college mathematicians that the training high school students in mathematics receive has vastly improved over the last few years. It is anticipated within the next 5 to 10 years the beginning college course for credit will be calculus, with all other mathematics having moved down into the high school.**

New Hampshire:

> **The strongest evidence of improved instruction comes from our State colleges. Without fail, they report a more "mathematically mature" student now entering college. The University of New Hampshire and Keene State College are revising their freshman year courses in the light of this. The university reports a significant drop in enrollments in precalculus courses. Keene State College is feeling the pressure at the upper undergraduate level. Students excused from college algebra, college trigonometry, etc., must be provided with advanced courses more suited to their needs. In 1964–65, a new staff member will be added to the mathematics department at Keene, in order that such courses may be provided.**

Louisiana:

> **There is some specific evidence of improvement in the teaching of mathematics: college mathematics courses for teachers in several colleges have been revised, and there is wider use in colleges of placement plans which eliminate basic courses for certain well-prepared students.**

Maine:

> **The chairmen of the modern language departments in all the liberal arts colleges and the University of Maine have indicated that their incoming students from Maine (as with students from out of the State) are now much better prepared. Two colleges have abolished their intermediate courses for freshmen since most applicants wishing to continue language study in college can now be placed in advanced courses.**

6.0 *Successful Administrative Practices*

Title III, NDEA, is a relatively new factor, a new influence in the departments of education of the participating States. It has taken time for those departments to mesh this Federal aid program with the always larger ongoing State-supported educational program and with other already-established Federal programs. It has taken time to secure State and local funds to match the Federal appropriations. It has taken time to explore the possible ways of using the title III authorization in harmony with the pattern of laws and practices in each of the States. The States have not all been equally successful in this respect. In answer to a question seeking to ascertain why there have been successful title III programs in some schools and not in others, the Delaware title III coordinator also explained much of the variation in programs from State to State:

> . . . local initiative and "dream power" is the answer . . . . Local taxpayers—who in Delaware must approve extra expenditures through referendum—Boards of Education, school administrators, and teachers do not dream at a uniform level.

6.1 *Making the Most of the Title III Project*

Although—as this report makes evident—supervisory leadership is the major contribution of title III, NDEA, to the improvement of instruction, the larger share of the money disbursed through title III goes for the acquisition of teaching materials and equipment. In the early months of NDEA, before there was a clear idea of what the role of the supervisors would be, title III was sometimes called "the hardware program." Today the success of a State's title III program can be measured along a continuum at one extreme of which the title III project (the contract under which a local school district participates in the acquisition program and receives reimbursement in Federal funds) is little more than a purchase order, while at the other extreme it is a complete, long-range plan for the improvement of instruction in that school district. Title III is a hardware program only to the extent that the title III project is allowed to be merely a purchase order. Fortunately, the "dream power" shown by the States' title III coordinators and supervisors has produced many effective ways of using the project, the contractual arrangement, to improve instruction. A close study of all the States' title III reports reveals the extraordinary extent to which the project is so used. This outline is a composite of those ways, all drawn from the States' reports and set forth in more detail in the excerpts which follow.

I. Preproject planning—
    A. Consultations with State supervisor, involving local teachers and administrators
II. The formal project application—
    A. The teachers' long-range plan to improve instruction
        1. Assessment of the local instructional program
        2. Statement of long- and short-range objectives
        3. Assuring teacher readiness
            a. Study and discussion
            b. Visits to other schools
            c. Plan for inservice education programs—NDEA, NSF, etc., institutes
        4. Curriculum revision
            a. Articulation with "feeder" schools and colleges
            b. New courses to be added—course sequences to be lengthened
            c. Use of upgraded teaching materials
        5. Commitment to evaluate the project's effectiveness
    B. Selection of materials and equipment to be acquired
        1. Compliance with technical standards
    C. Consideration of the need for minor remodeling

III. Checking and approving the project in the State office—
   A. Applying the State's standards and priorities
   B. Checking eligibility and appropriateness of items ordered

IV. Project followup—
   A. Visits by State supervisors and related services personnel
   B. State-level evaluation of the project's effectiveness

The annual reports on title III show clearly that by judicious use of the States' priorities and standards, by making proper use of the States' project application forms to gather information and provide guidance, and by involving the States' specialist supervisors closely in project planning, every title III project can contribute strongly to the improvement of instruction.

Delaware gives an overview of many of the procedures:

> Supervisors have assisted local schools in surveying their needs and in preparing the project proposals . . . . Supervisors can, in fact, survey the local situation to determine whether or not any such proposal is desirable or needed or what alternative might be suggested. This technique was particularly effective at the time of the reallocation of Federal funds in February and March of fiscal year 1964. Since the reallocation was more than two times the original amount of allocation to the State, Delaware would have been quite skeptical about such a large expenditure had it not been possible to be continuously in contact with the schools, through our supervisors . . . . The science supervisor said, "I have participated in the planning of many . . . projects . . . working with teacher committees or with administrative committees . . . . The best . . . are those where there has been a three-pronged approach at improving instruction: the teacher training has been upgraded, the facilities have been improved, and the program [curriculum] has been revised." Two examples of this three-pronged approach: At Laurel the biology teacher participated in the biology inservice program, the biology facilities were remodeled using title III funds, and the curriculum was revised and updated by the adoption of the BSCS Green Version. This resulted from meetings with the teacher, the superintendent of schools, the high school principal and finally with the Board of Education. At William Henry, the supervisor secured a place at the science institute at Franklin and Marshall College for the science teacher, title III helped purchase a planetarium, and the science program was revised to include a section on astronomy.

Many of the States publish and distribute to all their public schools manuals explaining the operations of title III. In the early days of title III these publications often explained little more than how to place an order. By fiscal year 1964 many of the manuals covered much of the above outline.

Delaware's statement about its foreign language publications is a good example:

> The title III "Workbook" was compiled as an aid to teachers and administrators in determining long-range goals and plans for foreign language programs. It encourages evaluation of various facets of the current program, and on the basis of this evaluation, requires projected plans for the development of the program. It is expected that this master plan, developed on a district basis, will serve (during the next few years) as a basis for several well-planned projects. Delaware also published in fiscal year 1964, "Guidelines for the Selection of Language Laboratories," and the "Delaware Standards" book was revised for acquisition under title III.

The Illinois report notes a special advantage in the use of such publications:

> Illinois has a 10-page booklet "Suggestions and Guidelines for Preparing Title III Science Project Applications," which answers most common questions about the purpose and procedures of the title III acquisition program in Illinois. It saves much useless travel and correspondence.

In each of the subject fields there are State publications to encourage and facilitate long-range planning; e.g., the Delaware construction guide to the design of a mathematics classroom or laboratory.

There is at least one State in which so little "dream power" had been applied to title III that teaching equipment and materials acquired under the title often arrived at local schools as a surprise to the teachers involved, and the State supervisor learned of them only by chance visits. In contrast to this, other States assured advance planning and consultation by means of a declaration of intent.

Idaho reports:

> When the supervisors expressed dissatisfaction with school districts' project planning in terms of local curriculum needs and instructional objectives, it was decided that local districts shall henceforth send to the supervisors a declaration of intent to place applications in advance. Such a procedure is meant to permit the supervisors to consult with the districts in project planning.

Illinois is another State which uses letters of intent to participate in the acquisitions program as a means of alerting the supervisors and enabling them to schedule visits for program planning.

There is a growing realization that if local professional leadership is to be developed and instruction improved, the local classroom teachers must be closely involved at every step in planning a title III project.

Washington reports on this point:

> We believe that the most successful title III programs have been those in which planning proceeded from the classroom level and was channeled upward to the area of administrative decision. Long-term planning, extensive committee work and the establishment of well-defined educational objectives have paid off in the title III program. On the other hand, administrators who see title III funds as a way of providing equipment regardless of teacher interest or training, have failed to improve instruction to any substantial degree.

Nebraska makes a pertinent comment:

> We believe the degree of success of a title III project is directly proportional to the amount of planning, especially at the local level, that precedes the project application. To this end we are asking for more evidence of this planning in our project applications.

Another point stressed in the States' reports is that it is in connection with the planning and proposal of title III projects that provision should be made for preparing the teachers to use the new materials and equipment. This often entails organizing inservice education programs for those teachers.

Illinois reports:

> Our experience continues to support the position that much improvement is still needed in science, mathematics, and foreign language instruction, and that acquisition of equipment and materials should not get beyond teacher readiness to utilize the equipment and materials; that there is a critical need for special supervision and consultant help in science, mathematics, and foreign language at local district level.

New Jersey:

> The basis for success or failure of title III programs seems to be the degree of planning by the local district. (Are the plans well-formulated, have teachers been involved in the plans, are teachers instructed in the use of new equipment, and have they participated in inservice programs that familiarize them with modern programs of instruction?)

Utah:

> The project application forms prepared by the science specialist and title III coordinator required outlines of the proposed curricular program, anticipated improvement in instruction, and inservice activities already engaged in, planned or needed to facilitate the use of the requested items.

Nevada:

> Some schools more efficiently use title III programs because it becomes part of a long-range plan in the improvement of instruction. In general, in those schools where programs have not been successful it is because title III has been used as a stopgap measure without long-range planning.

New York:

> In the event that an item is unusual and/or very expensive, this office approves the item on the basis of intended use and the recency and appropriateness of the training of the teacher.

Iowa:

> School district administrators and mathematics teachers have been encouraged to visit the pilot mathematics laboratories . . . established throughout the State before preparing mathematics projects.

There is wide consensus among the States that the specialist supervisors and related services personnel should be involved in the evaluation and approval of project applications under title III.

Florida:

> The supervisor of science education spent approximately 5 percent of his time on examining and approving projects. They are reviewed for (1) conformity to State standards; (2) consistency with the supervisory [long-range] plans filed in this office by the county; and (3) educational soundness and practicality in terms of his knowledge of the program in the particular county.

Delaware reports that some things cannot be approved:

> Having ascertained that the project is a valid one, then the supervisory staff reviews the program in detail and makes a supervisory judgment to determine whether or not the particular school involved does need this kind of project and whether this project will best expand or improve the offering in that school. If the answer to this question is found to be negative, then the supervisors are to be in touch with the schools to discuss a possible modification.

The task of examining title III applications for conformity to a State's standards and priorities, and of being certain of the eligibility of all items, is a major one. In order not to take too much of the specialist supervisor's time for this work and still take full advantage of his professional knowledge and his acquaintance with the local school situation, many States find ways to share the burden.

Connecticut reports:

> Connecticut has the supervisors review those items on project applications which the clerk is unable to identify and reach a decision on. The consultant must

> reach a decision regarding the approvability of such new items. Projects including items involving audiovisual devices and library books are referred to the consultant in audiovisual education and the consultant in school libraries. Regarding questionable items, whether old or new, the supervisor often confers with the local school to get further information and clarification. In some cases this involves correspondence and personal visits to the local school.

New Jersey:

> Since New Jersey hires consultants to work under the supervision of the foreign language supervisor in approving proposed projects, only 10 percent of the supervisor's time had to be spent in actual review of written projects. The foreign language supervisor has been freed from as much clerical work as possible in order to allow him more time in the field.

Utah reports on help received from NDEA, title X:

> Title X personnel did the detailed work associated with title III projects. The specialist was no longer a slave to an adding machine. This represented a tremendous gain for us in terms of freeing time for meaningful supervisory services.

Indiana:

> The subject field supervisors are responsible for the major evaluation of project applications. Other department personnel are readily available for necessary consultation, but do not play a major and direct role in project approval.

All in all, the reports make it plain that only rarely is the title III project a "mere purchase order." Rather, each project is more likely to be part of a vigorous, concerted effort by teachers and administrators who have taken stock of their situation, sought help from the most knowledgeable people, made a long-range plan for the improvement of instruction, provided for the inservice upgrading of the teachers involved, and who then carry out the plan and, finally, evaluate the work and take stock again.

6.2 *Using State Standards and Priorities to Assure Quality and Give Direction*

Close reading of the States' title III narrative reports reveals that in the broadest sense it is in the establishment and application of standards and priorities that the State school agencies have exploited least fully the possibilities of title III. "In the broadest sense" means in this context standards that go beyond specifications of physical quality and embrace such matters as the qualifications of teachers and vertical coordination of the curriculum, and priorities which reject "first come, first served" and "share and share alike" as criteria in favor of a systematic attack on the weaknesses in the States' public schools.

The application of priorities and standards requires first a realization of the powerful leverage they can give in any effort to bring about educational change. Second, their use is facilitated when it is necessary to choose among many projects competing for the same funds. The Oregon coordinator makes a pertinent statement in this regard:

> Overdemand for matching funds resulted in appointment of ad hoc advisory committees of school superintendents from the State at large to advise on the development of policies and priorities.

California, a State which has much greater demand from local school districts for title III matching monies than it can supply, selects among competing projects on the basis of an evaluation of the project proposals by a group of about 20 persons. The group includes subject matter specialists from local school districts and representatives of the offices of county superintendents of schools, universities and colleges, and the four instructional bureaus of the State department of education. This work is facilitated by use of a project evaluation check sheet.

Some States report using their standards and priorities to encourage consolidation of very small school districts. In a typical case of this kind they were used to make eligible only those units that maintain standards of enrollment, teacher-pupil ratios, grade structure, organization, etc., that could "contribute to an instructional environment conducive to efficient use of materials and equipment." By this criterion, out of 425 local agencies in the State, 319 are eligible, and 207 participated.

Colorado mentions that the State assigns priority to projects in need of additional assistance in order to improve currently substandard instructional programs, often found in the impoverished areas of the State. These projects require the submission of additional information to help decide which are most worthy. Mississippi has insisted that basic equipment be acquired before a school adds much enrichment equipment.

Delaware recalls a criterion in its State plan indicating that laboratories should not be added where qualified personnel are not available and indicating also that no title III funds should go into a language program except where the program is geared to a 3-year sequence in any particular foreign language. The report says that there have been instances where school districts were advised not to install language laboratories because qualified teachers were not available.

Massachusetts stresses its strict criteria for evaluation of projects in terms of expected improvement of instruction: inherent instructional value of the acquisitions, qualification and size of local staff, relation to curricular offerings, long-term pattern of acquisitions. This State points out that it has revised its State plan to permit reimbursement at a variable ratio, in order to "benefit impoverished areas of the State." Michigan notes that, "From the beginning of Michigan's participation in this program, we adopted a variable matching ratio by local school districts that provides preferential treatment to poorer districts. We may be said to have anticipated the current concern about impoverished areas." Minnesota is another State which uses a variable ratio of reimbursement for this purpose.

Nebraska uses a variable ratio of reimbursement for another purpose:

> We are reimbursing our schools on a variable basis (currently 45 percent), with the resulting earned State funds being used to improve our supervisory and related services program.

One State (North Carolina) has central purchasing of all school equipment and materials, which facilitates maintaining technical standards, and another says that "the local school district of New York City (with 35 percent of the State's public school pupils) maintains a bureau of standards which, for an educational institution, is the best in the United States."

Some comments by the State title III coordinators lead strongly to the inference that the programs are hampered by lack of standards and priorities.

> **Indiana:** Audiovisual materials have always constituted the major share of every science application in this State since the program began. Sometimes this has been to the sacrifice of other . . . needed equipment and materials.

> **Utah:** Utah has not established language laboratory specifications and enforced them. This has resulted in mechanical breakdowns and failures which in turn have acted to the detriment of the usefulness of language laboratories. Plans for next year include establishing a series of language laboratory specifications and enforcing them.

> **Tennessee:** Failure of school systems to get bids from more than one company, vulnerable administrators in the hands of high-powered salesmen, and inability of local systems to state specifications so that manufacturers of inferior equipment are eliminated.

> **Oklahoma:** Hopefully, local school personnel will plan long-range programs which provide for needed basic equipment first.

> **Missouri:** The superintendent, for instance, who proudly provided funds for a laboratory costing eight or ten thousand dollars sometimes balked at the expenditure of eighty or a hundred dollars for professionally prepared tapes integrated with an up-to-date audiolingual course, which could have put his original expenditure to significant use.

A brief analysis of the "principles of priority" set forth in the States' title III plans, to supplement the above information, reveals wide divergence. The accompanying table, "Priorities and 'Principles of Priorities' in State Title III Plans," shows that almost as much consideration goes to administrative and fiscal matters as to strictly pedagogical ones. Strictly speaking the three are often inseparable.

Priorities and "Principles of Priorities" in State Title III Plans

	Number of States
Administrative:	
Accreditation of schools	14
Minimum attendance	6
Maximum use of acquisitions	8
Maintenance, space, other facilities	24
Share and share alike	1
First come, first served	5
Previous project success	3
Fiscal:	
Evidence of local financial effort	15
Evidence of local need	16
Number of pupils served	10
Per pupil cost	12
Continue after NDEA	7
Meet technical standards	8
Pedagogical:	
Improve instruction	18
Balance the instructional program	14
Long-range planning	24
Qualified faculty	42
Balance pupil and teacher needs	5
Meet minimum standards	12
Go beyond minimum standards	10
Provide local supervision	7
Make local evaluation of projects	4
Provide for the gifted pupil	6
Provide for the underachiever	1
Pilot or demonstration projects	13
Provide guidance services	1

The table above shows plainly enough that the States are willing to use title III as leverage to bring about educational change. It suggests the dilemma in those State departments of education where the desire to serve all the State's children must be weighed against the desire to increase local effort and penalize or even eliminate very small schools which do not meet certain standards. The table also shows that the full potential of a priority system applied to title III for the improvement of instruction has not been realized.

6.3 *Techniques of Title III Program Evaluation*

Analysis of the States' narrative reports on NDEA, title III reveals more than 12 different approaches to a partial evaluation of the program. The same reports leave no doubt[1] that a completely objective, quantified assessment of the effectiveness of the program in terms of such variables as student enrollments, course of curriculum enrichment, teacher qualifications, and student achievement attributable to title III has not been carried out yet in any State, and is probably not yet feasible. Certainly, no assessment of these factors, nationwide, in comparable terms for all the States is presently possible, due to the wide variation and limitations of the States' capabilities for gathering the data.

The techniques of evaluation which have been used are here noted, each followed by one or more pertinent excerpts from the States' reports.

1. *Use of State agency's research and statistical services:*

   New York: The office of research and evaluation in the department has, for the past several months, been working on a worthy evaluation of the effects of title III in our State. We expect that the results will be available in January of 1965.

   Oregon: The State supervisors worked with the research section to devise a form from which data regarding science, mathematics, and modern foreign language offerings in individual schools can be readily obtained.

   Mississippi surveyed a sample of its districts: Phase I was a survey of the title III projects from 10 percent of the local school districts to determine sums approved for different types of equipment, materials, and minor remodeling, and to determine enrollments in all pertinent courses. Phase II used a questionnaire sent to the same districts to get their reactions to the title III program and suggestions for its improvement.

   Arkansas: The State supervisor of mathematics carried out an experiment in inservice education involving 16 elementary schools and over 500 teachers. Programed materials were used for the instruction, and attitude tests, questionnaires, and examinations were given to most of the participating teachers.

   Massachusetts: In 1964 these surveys were completed:

   1. "Survey of Modern Foreign Language Teachers in Service";
   2. "Study of Teacher Mobility and Sources of Teacher Supply";
   3. "Survey of Modern Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Programs in Massachusetts Colleges and Universities";
   4. "Course Offerings and Enrollments in Massachusetts Secondary Schools in 1963"; and
   5. "Course Offerings and Enrollments in Massachusetts Secondary Schools 1964."

   It is doubtful if comparable information is available for any other field at this time. Massachusetts is therefore in a favorable position to plan inservice training programs, to work with universities on programs of teacher preparation, to make recommendations regarding certification requirements, and in general to act on firm ground to strengthen instruction.

2. *Cooperation with other NDEA programs:*

   New Mexico: The statistics and research division (title X) supplied a listing of all mathematics teachers in grades 7–12, together with subjects taught, class enrollments, etc., from which a statewide directory was compiled.

   Nebraska: The information provided through title X has been very valuable in assessing various phases of the title III program. Little has been done to coordinate with other NDEA programs.

   New Jersey: The title X State staff has provided the title III office with more research and survey data than in the past. Steps are presently underway to transfer much of our information-collecting forms to data processing systems, through the assistance of title X staff.

3. *Studies by research departments of local school units:*

   New York: A study of effects of FLES was made under sponsorship of Hicksville Public School District. Principal investigator is Mr. William J. Campbell, Director of Research, Hicksville Public Schools.

   South Carolina: Every school district administrator was asked to give a "status report" of the title III program during the past year with a view to comparing the instructional program as it exists in the local districts now with the program as it was when the Act went into effect in 1958.

4. *University theses and dissertations:*

   Oregon: An evaluative study of the first four years of title III, sponsored by the State through title III, was made by Mr. Donald Empey as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Oregon.

---

[1] See chapter 5.0 above.

A conference on the impact of title III in Oregon is being planned to discuss implications of the above study, with invitations to the following:

Congressional Members of the State of Oregon
U.S. Office of Education
Oregon title III personnel, State level
County intermediate education district superintendents
Local school district superintendents
School board members
Community college representatives
News media.

Florida: A survey was conducted with guidance from the supervisor of science education in six selected counties of Florida to determine the impact which the NDEA program has had on the science program. It was conducted by Earl Brakken, an instructor in science education from Florida State University.

Tennessee: A study entitled "The Effect of NDEA, Title III on Secondary Science Programs in Tennessee" is now underway at the University of Tennessee. It should be completed by the end of 1965.

5. *Through contracts with outside agencies:*

California contracted with the independent consulting firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., for evaluation of its activities under title III.

6. *By the use of checklists:*

Oregon: The foreign language supervisor developed an informal evaluative device for self-evaluation on language programs. The publication was sent to all junior and senior highs in Oregon with the suggestion that one copy be returned to the State Department for use in determining future action at the State level. About 80 percent returned the form. The device "has had considerable impact upon the local districts which has resulted in some significant recommendations being made to school administrators and school boards." A followup is planned.

Oklahoma: Has used checklists sent to each local school as a means of assessing the title III programs there. These are self-evaluation checklists such as "A Suggested Checklist for Assessing a Science Program" (an OE publication).

Illinois: Is another State which uses "an evaluation checklist" for a unit district, elementary district, junior high, and high school for mathematics. Illinois issues "guidelines for the evaluation of foreign language instruction" to all schools in Illinois.

7. *Cooperation with national or regional studies:*

Iowa: Five states have joined to evaluate certain mathematics programs (the SMSG, the Illinois, the Maryland, and the Ball State College materials): Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin.

Rhode Island: The State participated in the "National Longitudinal Study in Mathematics Achievement," with schools participating from 13 towns.

8. *Use of project application forms to gather data:*

Delaware is moving toward a change in the approach for local project proposals. A workbook-type evaluative approach will be used in the future and will encompass long-range planning.

Wisconsin: A careful review of each local district's filed program [long-range plan for the improvement of instruction] is periodically made to determine status of program in light of plan objectives. In addition, a machine-scored inventory of equipment acquired has provided us with potential evaluative data which are now being used to determine progress toward program realization. A review of local participation on a county and legislative district basis is now under way. If the project application is a continuation of a previously submitted project, a progress report is submitted as well. Based upon this information, an evaluation of the appropriateness of the materials can be determined.

Iowa: The project application forms provide for evaluation reports and justification comments from participating schools.

9. *Visits to local schools:*

West Virginia: The administrative and supervisory staff members visit and review the title III programs in each of the 55 school districts within the State. To insure uniformity we have developed a special form for the review. Sources of information such as inservice training programs, project applications, and supervisory and related services personnel are used in making the evaluation.

Missouri: In depth reviews are made in certain school districts in science and modern foreign languages. . . . Commendation is given in those instances meriting same and suggestions are made about things that need to be strengthened. These surveys, because of the greater amount of time involved, permit more comprehensive analysis than the usual visit to local agencies.

10. *State evaluation by local school request:*

New York: The State has what is known as the Cooperative Review Service. This is a survey conducted upon the request of the school administration in which a team of supervisors from the department does a comprehensive and scholarly survey and report of a school system. Through these surveys we have gained firsthand knowledge regarding the effectiveness of the title III program.

11. *Use of standardized tests:*

Virgin Islands: Preliminary studies initiated by the title III State staff resulted in a recommendation to employ sequential tests of educational progress for high school grades in the 1964–65 school year. It is hoped that analyses of these tests will reveal improved instruction in science and mathematics based upon title III programs.

12. *Annual administrative review by title III personnel:* (See 5.0 above).

13. *Miscellaneous:*

Texas: A small research study by the title III mathematics supervisors will determine the growth that has taken place in participants of the Agency-sponsored inservice program. The teachers will take a standardized mathematics test before they begin the inservice program and another form of the same test at the conclusion of the program. A comparison of the scores will then be made.

Through the Texas State testing program, it will be possible by the end of fiscal year 1965 to compare scores on standardized science tests made by high school seniors who have attended participating schools with those of seniors not in participating districts and with seniors in their own district prior to participation in title III.

Iowa: The State is using machine data processing techniques to evaluate. They have worked on teacher preparation, analysis of equipment purchased by schools, and course enrollments.

Kentucky: The science laboratories and equipment in every school are evaluated each year either by a State science supervisor or a general supervisor. If deficiencies exist, a written report is returned to the local superintendent and the principal.

The States' narrative reports leave no doubt that they have not yet found completely satisfactory ways to evaluate their title III programs.

7.0 Problems, Needs, Highlight Statements

Six years' experience with NDEA, title III has resolved many issues that were debatable when the act was first put into effect:

> **. . . the provision of supervisory leadership is the title's greatest boon to education . . . the effectiveness of the equipment and materials acquisition program depends upon that leadership . . . qualified teachers are the heart of the matter, yet many teachers need much inservice education in order to become qualified . . . there are many ways to extend widely the amount of inservice education that can be provided through title III . . . effective K-to-B.A. curriculum coordination depends on leadership capable of speaking authoritatively to subject area specialists at all teaching levels . . . every title III local school project can be a "mere purchase order" or it can be part of a strong, all-embracing local movement to improve education—depending upon leadership at the State level . . . all of a State's resources must be marshaled to improve education; to do this requires strong professional leadership at the State level in each subject field. . . .**

The list could be extended.

7.1 Problems and Needs

Likewise the problems and needs have become increasingly apparent over the past six years. Again the most common ones will be listed and followed by brief, typical comments from the States' reports.

1. *Need for more specialist supervisors:*

   New York: A worthy improvement in the Federal program would be an increase in the supervisory and administrative funds allotted to the States. To increase the number of supervisors would greatly enhance the ability to improve classroom instruction in the local schools.

   Colorado: The most needed . . . additions are related to the improvement of inservice education . . . for teachers . . . it is clear that three additional consultants, one in each subject area, could easily be absorbed.

   Indiana: Funds and personnel for inservice workshops.

   Illinois: One of our greatest problems is the securing of qualified personnel to serve as consultants in the areas of science, mathematics, and foreign language. Many school districts in the northern section of our State can afford to pay higher salaries, and this makes it difficult for this office to hire the professional personnel that we must have.

2. *Inservice education to upgrade the teaching staffs:*

   Maine: There is a great need for more inservice training of teachers in the elementary grades. There is need for a continued effort to provide more funds for the supervisory services account. Maine needs additional State supervisors to work closely with local schools on a regional basis [since there are virtually no local supervisors] and consultants for inservice professional training of teachers.

   New York: The largest unmet need and problem is the inservice training of teachers at all levels required to teach revised programs successfully.

   District of Columbia: It is hard to attract and hold superior teachers. They are accepting better paying positions in industry and government service.

   Florida: The mathematics supervisor says, "The greatest unmet need is money to initiate inservice courses under the department of education. As yet *none* has been used for this purpose. I have been told none is available for next year."

   Indiana: Science man says greatest need is to accelerate teacher preparation at the elementary school level. "It is hoped that in the years ahead, title III will be able to participate to a greater extent than it does at the level of teacher improvement programs, such as workshops, institutes, and summer programs."

3. *The lack of matching funds at the local level:*

   Kentucky: Our major problem is still the same. Lack of local matching funds greatly limits the participation of our districts in the acquisition program. The State supervisory and related services program is hampered by lack of personnel.

   Louisiana: The main problems . . . locating the matching funds on the State and local level. . . . In the State supervisory services program . . . the lack of funds for travel and to support additional specialist personnel. The State department of education has requested in its budget each year that the title III supervisory and related services funds be matched with State funds. Each year this request has been denied. . . .

4. *Lack of funds at the State level:*

   Hawaii: Additional staff and resources needed for an adequate State program of supervisory and related services are (*a*) an administrator of title III pro-

grams with part-time or full-time responsibilities instead of present coordinator assuming NDEA responsibilities as additional assignment to regular duties as science supervisor; (*b*) clerical assistance; (*c*) an additional science supervisor and an additional mathematics supervisor.

Montana: The major problems confronting us this year are those that we have had in the past years; namely, lack of matching funds for the acquisition program and minor remodeling and lack of time and financial assistance for the supervisory program.

Guam: As has been reported for the past three years, the State was financially unable to employ supervisory personnel specifically for science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. With our trying situations in Guam, title III programs are genuinely welcome by all concerned.

Colorado: The normal allocation to Colorado is approximately 30 percent less than the need of the State, and this need is expected to continue at a roughly constant level.

5. *Administrative problems:*

Iowa: Late apportionment [reallocation] of Federal funds places hardships on and creates problems for local school districts, since our plan does not give final approval to projects until funds have been made available to the State. The short time for making use of the extra title III funds handicapped many of the school districts since their budgets could not provide for the matching funds.

Minnesota: A major problem is the June 30 cutoff date. Many projects are completed during the summer and acquisition and storage of equipment prior to June 30 is now required when installation may not be made until July or August. This has increased local costs and is a detriment to long-range planning. The failure of Congress to extend the title III program for longer periods of time is also a detriment to long-range planning.

Maryland: Some concern has been expressed at the local level regarding the amount of time and effort required by local supervisors to develop and process NDEA acquisition projects. The amount of detailed work required with no Federal assistance for clerical help can conceivably limit and curtail the supervisors' activities in other important phases of instructional improvement.

Connecticut: . . . Many small school districts do not participate in the title III program simply because there is no one available to give the necessary time to the development of a project application. . . . In those school systems where one person has been assigned title III responsibility with time to devote to title III projects, there is much more advantage taken of title III funds and the applications for project approval and reimbursement are usually better and more carefully prepared.

New York: Since the inception of title III, the State program for supervisory and related services has been greatly expanded . . . [But] it should be recognized that in the area of personal services the element of long-range planning must be present. Since title III has been on a yearly basis, this necessary stability has been lacking. The recent reallocations have, of course, not encouraged long-range stability but have encouraged "hardware" purchasing at the end of the year . . . . An increase in supervisory budgets with the stability of long-range planning would help solve the recurring problem of the need for continually increasing the State-provided supervisory services in the field . . . . [Title III allotments for supervisory services are so limited that] it becomes increasingly difficult to select for top priority only those items which the limited funds make possible. To increase the amount by 50 percent for a guaranteed period of at least five years would help broaden the program and give it the required stability.

Maine: Procedures for securing interim State allotments are extremely difficult if not impossible. The timelag necessary in the acquisition of State funds as well as lack of assurance of Federal allotment for future fiscal periods has been the limiting factor in the securing of funds to match reallotment provisions.

Delaware: There is a great need for forms on which data requested in this report and of interest to the supervisor are gathered, recorded and organized, showing the status of the foreign language program in the State from year to year. Particularly in the area of inservice education, it has been impossible for us to proceed to the extent that time and energy would allow because funds cannot be anticipated far enough in advance.

7.2 Highlight Statements

New York: Many factors, which will persist in the foreseeable future, make continued title III aid most desirable for the improvement of instruction. Technological advances open new areas for instruction . . . and the schools are requesting more sophisticated and expensive laboratory apparatus. Increased retention of pupils in school programs offers curricular challenges. Swelling school populations tax the districts' ability to provide adequately. Classroom and laboratory equipment in senior high school has become increasingly sophisticated as course content has been expanded. Much of the material formerly presented in senior high schools is now being moved into the junior high school. Advanced placement courses in high school now require equipment formerly available only to college students. Actual laboratory-type experimentation by students is now replacing the less satisfactory teacher demonstration method. These implications provide a sustained need for increasing amounts of title III aid . . . .

Oklahoma: The dilemma: Oklahoma requires 24 semester hours in modern foreign languages for standard certification and 18 hours for provisional certification. It would be desirable to raise these requirements, but there is an extreme shortage of teachers trained to teach a foreign language in Oklahoma. The State loses a heavy percentage of these graduates to neighboring States which pay larger salaries, and if the requirements were raised, many Oklahoma high schools could not offer a foreign language at all.

Rhode Island: Only last year several educators expressed a belief that after 5 years there would be a decrease in applications for new acquisitions [of equipment for modern foreign language study]; whereas, this past year has shown the largest amount of NDEA, title III applications for project approval of any year since the inception of NDEA.

Kentucky: Our major problem is still the same. Lack of local matching funds greatly limits the participation of our districts in the acquisition program. The State supervisory and related services program is hampered by lack of personnel. We only matched 50 percent of the funds allocated to Kentucky.

North Dakota: The general reaction to the title III program has been excellent. Almost every participating school feels that its strongest programs, best curriculums and materials, best prepared teachers—therefore the most keenly interested students—are found in the areas supported by Title III.

Appendix

Financial and Statistical Data on the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands

Fiscal Year 1964 and
Fiscal Years 1959–64 (summary)

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-1964	1,555	$1,769,494	39
1959-64	8,758	10,120,725	342
Mathematics:			
1963-64	675	341,425	1
1959-64	5,436	1,945,395	5
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	270	299,318	2
1959-64	1,445	986,262	11
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	745	180,167	11
1959-64	7,455	3,002,210	34
Secondary:			
1963-64	1,034	886,087	31
1959-64	6,882	7,436,862	288
Combined:			
1963-64	721	1,343,983	0
1959-64	1,302	2,523,308	36

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federa 1963–64

Subject
Science
Mathematics
Modern foreign languages
Source:
Federal*
State
Local

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal ye only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Fur

Period	Expenditure
1963-64	0
1959-64	$5,807,007

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	5.125
Mathematics	2.875
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	3.833
Supervisory	10.417
Related services	.416
Secretarial, clerical	7.166

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$72,513
State	112,809

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$72,513	$72,513
1959-64	288,085	397,537

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	123	812,097
Eligible under State plan	123	812,097
Participating	118	808,059

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	39	$77,489	0
1959–64	125	407,170	3
Mathematics:			
1963–64	12	7,631	0
1959–64	40	43,733	1
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	17	22,045	0
1959–64	40	125,134	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	2	3,737	0
1959–64	28	117,665	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	32	39,667	0
1959–64	118	318,004	4
Combined:			
1963–64	34	63,761	0
1959–64	59	140,368	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$77,489
Mathematics	7,631
Modern foreign languages	22,045
Source:	
Federal*	53,582
State	25,762
Local	27,821

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$42,469	$43,669
1959–64	287,105	289,706

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0.375
Mathematics	.375
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$12,431
State	12,431

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	138	52,868
Eligible under State plan	138	52,868
Participating	122	46,754

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.25
Supervisory	.75
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	1.0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$12,431	$13,500
1959–64	56,465	97,500

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0
Mathematics:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0
Secondary:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0
Combined:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign languages	0
Source:	
Federal	0
State	0
Local	0

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	0	0
1959-64	0	$2,230,086

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	0
State	0

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	0	0
Eligible under State plan	0	0
Participating	0	0

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	0
Supervisory	0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	0	0
1959-64	0	$121,994

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	692	$1,258,474	28
1959-64	3,580	6,422,087	277
Mathematics:			
1963-64	265	167,073	4
1959-64	1,167	378,145	8
Modern Foreign Languages:			
1963-64	131	125,495	9
1959-64	605	864,525	15
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	165	115,451	6
1959-64	808	800,055	8
Secondary:			
1963-64	405	570,006	11
1959-64	1,025	2,772,796	123
Combined:			
1963-64	538	865,565	15
1959-64	2,600	4,131,022	160

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,219,991
Mathematics	167,454
Modern foreign languages	121,222
Source:	
Federal*	609,222
State	2,960
Local	909,333

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$520,490	$541,434
1959-64	1,910,304	3,020,701

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	$42,140
State	44,086

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	415	415,322
Eligible under State plan	415	415,322
Participating	304	380,327

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	3.0
Supervisory	6.5
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	2.5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$42,140	$42,140
1959-64	226,082	234,828

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	902	$7,152,590	120
1959-64	3,796	24,214,898	1,141
Mathematics:			
1963-64	441	1,840,336	15
1959-64	1,263	4,142,285	162
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	676	3,241,620	39
1959-64	1,678	11,880,762	350
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	768	1,671,023	25
1959-64	3,260	13,628,274	1,120
Secondary:			
1963-64	972	7,761,720	127
1959-64	3,368	24,880,422	736
Combined:			
1963-64	40	768,410	3
1959-64	120	1,978,147	30

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	$9,844,397
Mathematics	1,848,064
Modern foreign languages	3,449,865
Source:	
Federal*	5,291,107
State	0
Local	8,250,659

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$2,619,216	$5,220,828
1959-64	15,802,146	18,220,228

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	2
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	2

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	6
Supervisory	5
Related services	1
Secretarial, clerical	15

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	$280,337
State	280,337

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$280,337	$319,508
1959-64	1,406,802	1,581,455

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1,586	4,008,076
Eligible under State plan	1,586	4,008,076
Participating	627	3,010,269

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	154	$1,355,136	4
1959-64	978	4,696,571	94
Mathematics:			
1963-64	53	155,221	1
1959-64	321	808,818	5
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	59	400,679	1
1959-64	335	1,674,832	85
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	48	243,418	0
1959-64	374	1,120,348	11
Secondary:			
1963-64	161	1,316,056	6
1959-64	954	4,377,858	152
Combined:			
1963-64	57	351,562	0
1959-64	306	1,379,315	21

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,191,806
Mathematics	49,712
Modern foreign languages	460,768
Source:	
Federal*	905,006
State	154,888
Local	730,420

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$790,873	$931,372
1959-64	3,262,709	3,444,358

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$37,166
State	41,306

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	224	457,820
Eligible under State plan	224	457,820
Participating	127	430,210

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1
Supervisory	3
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	4

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$37,166	$37,166
1959-64	200,840	222,057

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	224	$534,069	0
1959-64	1,230	3,680,022	27
Mathematics:			
1963-64	80	182,006	0
1959-64	475	702,491	4
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	84	218,457	1
1959-64	481	1,790,287	38
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	101	149,161	0
1959-64	690	752,806	1
Secondary:			
1963-64	149	404,658	1
1959-64	967	2,882,259	44
Combined:			
1963-64	138	380,628	0
1959-64	529	2,516,716	24

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	$916,873
Mathematics	110,048
Modern foreign languages	426,522
Source:	
Federal*	672,064
State	0
Local	781,396

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964 against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$502,558	$572,55
1959-64	2,386,215	2,862,10

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	$27,730
State	27,730

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	178	515,165
Eligible under State plan	178	515,165
Participating	129	435,363

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.45
Supervisory	3
Related services	.10
Secretarial, clerical	3

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$27,730	$31,030
1959-64	120,646	237,968

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	48	$323,817	0
1959-64	178	1,040,108	0
Mathematics:			
1963-64	25	41,218	0
1959-64	112	128,935	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	22	60,224	0
1959-64	96	287,756	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	4	1,517	0
1959-64	13	4,432	0
Secondary:			
1963-64	6	97,138	0
1959-64	24	152,202	0
Combined:			
1963-64	85	326,263	0
1959-64	348	1,297,564	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	$457,543
Mathematics	33,851
Modern foreign language	35,134
Source:	
Federal*	263,263
State	0
Local	263,265

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1964 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$263,263	$276,216
1959-64	659,364	672,451

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.25
Supervisory	3.0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	3.0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	$21,798
State	21,800

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$21,798	$25,000
1959-64	85,180	125,000

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	86	96,299
Eligible under State plan	86	96,299
Participating	48	82,900

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	38	$86,649	4
1959–64	447	847,816	60
Mathematics:			
1963–64	36	17,412	4
1959–64	549	132,720	4
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	28	19,158	8
1959–64	181	120,417	29
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	7	4,601	0
1959–64	636	120,008	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	96	95,112	16
1959–64	516	867,116	92
Combined:			
1963–64		23,506	0
1959–64	35	113,829	1

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$86,650
Mathematics	17,412
Modern foreign languages	19,158
Source:	
Federal*	61,610
State	61,610
Local	0

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	$63,150
1959–64	$530,152	608,773

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	2.25
Mathematics	2
Modern foreign language	2

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$20,000
State	24,325

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1	137,858
Eligible under State plan	1	137,858
Participating	1	137,858

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.3
Supervisory	6.25
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	4.3

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$20,000	$20,000
1959–64	101,790	120,000

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	809	$3,394,794	10
1959–64	2,695	12,553,610	351
Mathematics:			
1963–64	486	689,692	0
1959–64	1,451	1,997,984	40
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	399	926,696	14
1959–64	1,294	3,224,726	63
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	470	516,174	0
1959–64	1,266	1,845,846	8
Secondary:			
1963–64	667	2,643,111	24
1959–64	2,108	8,153,415	118
Combined:			
1963–64	557	1,851,897	0
1959–64	2,066	7,777,058	228

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$3,293,699
Mathematics	530,848
Modern foreign languages	706,629
Source:	
Federal*	2,265,588
State	0
Local	2,265,588

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$1,024,276	$1,819,107
1959–64	6,778,311	7,962,265

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	2
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	5
Supervisory	7
Related services	2
Secretarial, clerical	15

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$104,632
State	153,684

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$104,632	$104,633
1959–64	492,624	492,624

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	79	1,097,133
Eligible under State plan	79	1,097,133
Participating	65	1,084,721

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	5,143	$4,558,750	75
1959-64	22,133	13,506,017	188
Mathematics:			
1963-64	2,587	946,865	3
1959-64	10,197	2,857,698	3
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	1,379	741,886	0
1959-64	6,154	2,905,817	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	5,043	1,469,223	3
1959-64	22,799	6,309,473	10
Secondary:			
1963-64	2,884	3,945,652	76
1959-64	11,335	9,897,656	179
Combined:			
1963-64	1,182	872,396	1
1959-64	4,349	2,773,067	1

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$3,651,721
Mathematics	822,782
Modern foreign languages	635,843
Source:	
Federal*	2,555,173
State	13,500
Local	2,541,673

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditur	Allotment
1963-64	$1,024,463	$1,521,878
1959-64	8,044,273	9,535,212

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	5.0
Mathematics	3.0
Modern foreign language	1.2

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$98,798
State	98,798

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	196	1,006,848
Eligible under State plan	196	1,006,848
Participating	196	1,006,848

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.4
Supervisory	9.2
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	9.0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$98,798	$100,000
1959-64	482,276	482,281

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	461	$208,464	6
1959–64	2,029	1,225,882	235
Mathematics:			
1963–64	197	35,005	0
1959–64	957	231,133	10
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	89	46,755	1
1959–64	417	168,758	9
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	356	56,840	0
1959–64	1,854	616,357	163
Secondary:			
1963–64	283	192,286	6
1959–64	993	770,275	64
Combined:			
1963–64	108	41,098	1
1959–64	556	229,142	27

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$188,301
Mathematics	33,463
Modern foreign languages	30,507
Source:	
Federal*	126,136
State	116,778
Local	9,357

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal years 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$12,607	$43,564
1959–64	785,192	822,519

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1.4
Mathematics	1.4
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0
Supervisory	2.8
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	2.4

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$20,000
State	39,977

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$20,000	$20,000
1959–64	78,989	94,000

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1	153,242
Eligible under State plan	1	153,242
Participating	1	153,242

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	197	$384,884	10
1959-64	731	2,242,960	114
Mathematics:			
1963-64	61	64,933	0
1959-64	200	157,613	4
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	46	56,802	1
1959-64	161	318,957	10
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	106	126,138	0
1959-64	344	542,902	3
Secondary:			
1963-64	198	380,451	11
1959-64	748	2,176,619	125
Combined:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	$406,491
Mathematics	49,030
Modern foreign languages	45,315
Source:	
Federal*	250,418
State	0
Local	250,418

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	0	$28,910
1959-64	$937,563	1,363,373

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	0.5
Mathematics	.5
Modern foreign language	1.0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	$19,761
State	19,761

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	120	165,527
Eligible under State plan	120	165,527
Participating	73	140,365

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	1
Supervisory	2
Related services	--------
Secretarial, clerical	2

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$19,761	$20,000
1959-64	87,302	120,000

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	799	$4,287,960	121
1959–64	4,562	19,367,118	439
Mathematics:			
1963–64	321	441,992	0
1959–64	1,352	1,722,816	1
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	314	970,822	7
1959–64	1,267	4,275,439	87
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	468	1,110,991	9
1959–64	2,323	5,194,979	92
Secondary:			
1963–64	545	2,286,779	44
1959–64	3,067	11,661,082	279
Combined:			
1963–64	421	2,303,004	75
1959–64	1,791	8,509,312	156

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$6,238,844
Mathematics	554,436
Modern foreign languages	1,184,793
Source:	
Federal*	3,344,099
State	0
Local	4,633,974

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$2,310,649	$2,310,649
1959–64	10,925,190	11,148,454

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	6
Mathematics	4
Modern foreign language	3

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$167,913
State	167,913

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1,508	1,617,255
Eligible under State plan	1,508	1,617,255
Participating	1,083	1,161,464

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1
Supervisory	13
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	16

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$167,913	$177,600
1959–64	798,244	1,001,718

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	323	$2,120,768	38
1959–64	2,711	12,360,728	234
Mathematics:			
1963–64	181	149,145	0
1959–64	960	773,273	1
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	160	415,780	4
1959–64	804	2,501,740	47
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	181	247,605	2
1959–64	846	1,177,586	6
Secondary:			
1963–64	534	1,946,618	39
1959–64	1,725	8,116,007	205
Combined:			
1963–64	249	491,470	1
1959–64	1,904	6,342,149	71

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,753,406
Mathematics	85,527
Modern foreign languages	414,744
Source:	
Federal*	1,126,837
State	0
Local	1,126,840

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$758,626	$1,234,896
1959–64	6,296,706	7,632,098

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1.5
Mathematics	.5
Modern foreign language	.5

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$25,669
State	25,669

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	669	1,072,108
Eligible under State plan	669	1,072,108
Participating	334	835,253

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.5
Supervisory	2.5
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	3.0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$25,669	$63,164
1959–64	170,508	475,196

8

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	746	$1,102,406	30
1959–64	3,009	9,250,948	217
Mathematics:			
1963–64	308	202,223	3
1959–64	1,226	970,671	11
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	175	218,557	3
1959–64	582	1,391,932	9
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	314	260,444	1
1959–64	1,438	2,036,924	13
Secondary:			
1963–64	915	1,262,742	35
1959–64	3,379	9,576,627	224
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,999,775
Mathematics	351,116
Modern forgign languages	347,923
Source:	
Federal*	1,329,073
State	0
Local	1,369,741

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$673,283	$864,952
1959–64	4,649,588	5,240,667

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	2
Mathematics	2
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$54,731
State	54,731

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	697	564,208
Eligible under State plan	697	564,208
Participating	292	493,062

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.3
Supervisory	6.05
Related services	1.5
Secretarial, clerical	6.75

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$54,731	$56,642
1959–64	241,516	306,406

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	505	$993,260	10
1959–64	2,832	5,809,062	245
Mathematics:			
1963–64	138	94,776	3
1959–64	613	304,256	4
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	125	220,427	5
1959–64	611	1,381,498	40
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	250	257,488	
1959–64	1,380	1,368,742	
Secondary:			
1963–64	421	743,215	9
1959–64	2,259	4,533,190	198
Combined:			
1963–64	97	307,760	5
1959–64	417	1,592,885	54

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$967,597
Mathematics	86,695
Modern foreign languages	188,916
Source:	
Federal*	621,604
State	0
Local	621,604

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$338,268	$344,284
1959–64	3,419,940	3,498,703

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$28,805
State	28,805

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1,775	445,049
Eligible under State plan	1,575	444,600
Participating	505	66,302

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.5
Supervisory	3
Related services	.083
Secretarial, clerical	2.5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$28,805	$30,000
1959–64	128,335	224,547

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	1,499	$1,961,533	32
1959–64	5,008	10,364,623	229
Mathematics:			
1963–64	448	331,202	0
1959–64	1,722	1,732,840	12
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	257	273,661	2
1959–64	941	1,628,045	7
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	1,084	826,922	0
1959–64	3,387	4,263,740	19
Secondary:			
1963–64	1,120	1,739,474	34
1959–64	4,283	9,457,067	229
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	1	4,701	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,330,623
Mathematics	208,358
Modern foreign languages	256,031
Source:	
Federal*	897,496
State	0
Local	897,496

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, agnst fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	$127,059
1959–64	$913,710	6,355,872

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1.6
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–6

Function	Number
Administrative	1
Supervisory	1.6
Related services	2.12
Secretarial, clerical	3.67

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$34,106
State	34,106

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$34,106	$48,735
1959–64	149,533	344,424

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	212	652,539
Eligible under State plan	212	652,539
Participating	197	639,539

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	1,059	$1,510,537	119
1959–64	5,059	5,098,480	257
Mathematics:			
1963–64	372	107,586	0
1959–64	1,916	459,370	1
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	167	250,012	5
1959–64	806	758,650	32
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	685	210,728	1
1959–64	3,438	1,197,917	23
Secondary:			
1963–64	195	356,504	4
1959–64	1,187	1,597,697	57
Combined:			
1963–64	718	1,300,903	119
1959–64	3,156	3,520,885	210

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,452,499
Mathematics	124,806
Modern foreign laguages	155,706
Source:	
Federal*	866,505
State	115,683
Local	750,823

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	$300,000
1959–64	$2,727,408	6,903,515

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	2.75
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$72,039
State	73,323

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	67	735,539
Eligible under State plan	67	735,539
Participating	55	618,662

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	2.9
Supervisory	5.95
Related services	.3
Secretarial, clerical	6.7

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$72,039	$72,039
1959–64	364,950	388,317

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	407	$576, 416	0
1959-64	1, 558	2, 756, 085	0
Mathematics:			
1963–64	136	37, 818	0
1959–64	572	136, 494	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	104	136, 368	0
1959–64	389	447, 353	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	345	187, 205	0
1959–64	1, 124	646, 842	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	302	563, 397	0
1959–64	1, 016	2, 061, 508	0
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	379	631, 582	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$492, 287
Mathematics	27, 283
Modern foreign languages	91, 966
Source:	
Federal*	305, 768
State	0
Local	305, 768

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	$138, 225
1959–64	$1, 110, 228	1, 717, 601

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$22, 000
State	22, 572

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	425	215, 418
Eligible under State plan	319	211, 882
Participating	207	189, 223

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1
Supervisory	3
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	2

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$22, 000	$22, 000
1959–64	107, 644	123, 253

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	642	$2,074,032	6
1959–64	2,480	7,379,632	76
Mathematics:			
1963–64	191	169,090	0
1959–64	831	778,579	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	75	371,676	1
1959–64	343	1,539,707	18
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	385	427,204	0
1959–64	1,461	1,776,530	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	441	1,968,936	7
1959–64	1,915	7,066,491	91
Combined:			
1963–64	82	218,658	0
1959–64	278	854,895	3

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$2,870,345
Mathematics	191,952
Modern foreign languages	658,636
Source:	
Federal*	1,860,465
State	0
Local	1,860,468

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$1,156,216	$1,425,189
1959–64	4,614,611	5,285,990

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0.5
Mathematics	.5
Modern foreign language	.5

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$26,279
State	26,281

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	24	656,799
Eligible under State plan	24	656,799
Participating	24	656,799

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0
Supervisory	1.5
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	1.0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$26,279	$43,005
1959–64	124,666	316,048

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	669	$2,921,390	94
1959–64	2,973	9,452,619	314
Mathematics:			
1963–64	242	376,680	16
1959–64	957	1,061,731	50
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	221	726,742	31
1959–64	942	3,182,655	127
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	229	359,798	22
1959–64	1,260	1,933,250	63
Secondary:			
1963–64	726	2,740,392	115
1959–64	3,078	9,746,097	413
Combined:			
1963–64	177	924,622	4
1959–64	534	2,017,658	15

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$2,921,390
Mathematics	376,680
Modern foreign languages	726,742
Source:	
Federal*	2,012,406
State	0
Local	2,012,406

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$1,673,287	$1,716,636
1959–64	6,419,350	6,466,493

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	2
Modern foreign language	2

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$60,897
State	60,896

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	392	926,350
Eligible under State plan	392	926,350
Participating	283	858,341

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	9
Supervisory	5
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$60,897	$76,750
1959–64	244,654	481,709

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	414	$4, 153, 581	291
1959–64	2, 652	18, 122, 533	2, 481
Mathematics:			
1963–64	226	704, 094	599
1959–64	1, 500	2, 675, 841	2, 055
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	216	993, 252	1
1959–64	1, 245	5, 156, 681	501
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	44	362, 559	3
1959–64	694	872, 105	181
Secondary:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0
Combined:			
1963–64	812	5, 488, 368	888
1959–64	4, 703	25, 082, 949	4, 856

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$3, 968, 354
Mathematics	844, 768
Modern foreign languages	750, 584
Source:	
Federal*	2, 694, 837
State	0
Local	2, 868, 869

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments. This amount is subject to change pending receipt of revised Annual Financial Report.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$2, 677, 087	$2, 706, 559
1959–64	12, 673, 788	12, 713, 069

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$29, 697
State	42, 411

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1, 543	1, 856, 895
Eligible under State plan	1, 543	1, 856, 895
Participating	426	1, 590, 361

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1
Supervisory	3
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	4

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$29, 697	$32, 423
1959–64	87, 813	745, 573

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	719	$2,359,109	0
1959–64	3,765	12,076,599	307
Mathematics:			
1963–64	400	205,168	0
1959–64	1,849	598,820	2
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	194	467,721	0
1959–64	833	1,642,468	11
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	488	535,216	0
1959–64	2,300	2,287,252	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	757	2,431,576	0
1959–64	3,875	11,802,157	320
Combined:			
1963–64	68	65,206	0
1959–64	272	228,480	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$3,058,001
Mathematics	182,254
Modern foreign languages	473,589
Source:	
Federal*	1,818,472
State	0
Local	1,895,372

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$1,122,130	$1,193,357
1959–64	6,495,894	6,567,812

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	3
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.5
Supervisory	5.5
Related services	1.2
Secretarial, clerical	4.0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$61,152
State	61,152

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$61,152	$70,220
1959–64	251,317	378,260

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	479	718,352
Eligible under State plan	479	718,352
Participating	402	702,952

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	538	$1,131,683	7
1959–64	2,053	6,080,954	100
Mathematics:			
1963–64	283	121,965	0
1959–64	1,126	607,036	3
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	193	178,395	0
1959–64	658	773,582	2
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	114	55,554	0
1959–64	388	281,479	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	319	643,666	5
1959–64	897	1,772,203	25
Combined:			
1963–64	581	732,823	2
1959–64	2,552	5,407,890	80

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$298,317
Mathematics	36,710
Modern foreign languages	59,995
Source:	
Federal*	197,511
State	0
Local	197,511

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	$522,072
1959–64	$2,368,837	5,313,358

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$33,473
State	33,473

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64·

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	165	616,671
Eligible under State plan	165	616,671
Participating	135	533,473

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	2.583
Supervisory	3
Related services	.33
Secretarial, clerical	4.22

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$33,473	$35,530
1959–64	164,906	267,599

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	1,242	$1,878,361	0
1959–64	6,411	8,341,292	125
Mathematics:			
1963–64	684	248,199	0
1959–64	3,149	963,558	30
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	333	319,685	0
1959–64	1,564	1,711,261	37
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	857	691,431	0
1959–64	4,258	3,297,506	7
Secondary:			
1963–64	1,137	1,569,313	0
1959–64	5,761	7,087,501	183
Combined:			
1963–64	265	185,501	0
1959–64	1,105	631,106	2

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$2,292,268
Mathematics	293,537
Modern foreign languages	388,541
Source:	
Federal*	1,487,173
State	0
Local	1,487,173

* Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$450,540	$523,171
1959–64	4,643,523	5,887,579

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	2
Mathematics	2
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$59,822
State	59,822

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1,224	753,706
Eligible under State plan	563	705,916
Participating	442	568,424

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.2
Supervisory	7.0
Related services	1.0
Secretarial, clerical	2.0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$59,822	$70,000
1959–64	283,622	424,804

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	354	$346,888	16
1959–64	1,371	1,738,154	92
Mathematics:			
1963–64	105	28,338	1
1959–64	403	116,361	5
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	69	50,945	1
1959–64	296	261,223	7
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	202	95,721	1
1959–64	800	433,920	10
Secondary:			
1963–64	244	281,513	11
1959–64	1,037	1,453,500	75
Combined:			
1963–64	82	48,937	6
1959–64	233	228,319	19

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$367,756
Mathematics	33,894
Modern foreign languages	69,778
Source:	
Federal*	233,550
State	0
Local	237,878

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$54,374	$180,611
1959–64	904,576	1,275,774

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0.75
Mathematics	.75
Modern foreign language	.325

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$18,448
State	18,574

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	965	157,403
Eligible under State plan	965	157,403
Participating	212	108,729

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.167
Supervisory	1.825
Related services	1.125
Secretarial, clerical	1.167

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$18,448	$20,000
1959–64	103,725	120,000

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	314	$485,526	11
1959-64	1,658	4,062,112	280
Mathematics:			
1963-64	152	56,738	1
1959-64	824	358,141	22
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	84	131,303	0
1959-64	457	688,075	20
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	147	102,470	0
1959-64	617	581,200	35
Secondary:			
1963-64	261	448,002	12
1959-64	1,768	3,760,675	250
Combined:			
1963-64	142	123,095	0
1959-64	554	766,453	37

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	$655,116
Mathematics	51,254
Modern foreign languages	130,141
Source:	
Federal*	418,255
State	0
Local	418,256

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$4,526	$200,451
1959-64	2,058,990	2,381,843

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	$16,198
State	16,198

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	2,500	312,000
Eligible under State plan	248	245,000
Participating	176	203,500

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.25
Supervisory	1.083
Related services	.25
Secretarial, clerical	1.5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$16,198	$19,230
1959-64	93,450	154,915

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	83	$141,945	0
1959–64	294	429,929	9
Mathematics:			
1963–64	31	15,544	0
1959–64	132	56,331	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	27	41,906	0
1959–64	98	195,790	2
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	45	82,302	0
1959–64	154	144,556	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	92	114,891	0
1959–64	343	492,973	11
Combined:			
1963–64	4	2,202	0
1959–64	27	44,522	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$80,436
Mathematics	12,387
Modern foreign languages	30,520
Source:	
Federal*	61,671
State	0
Local	61,672

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$34,453	$71,909
1959–64	269,477	320,042

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$18,276
State	18,276

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	17	86,271
Eligible under State plan	17	86,271
Participating	14	83,572

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1
Supervisory	3
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	1

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$18,276	$20,000
1959–64	77,497	120,000

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	396	$371,343	2
1959–64	1,664	1,487,508	13
Mathematics:			
1963–64	128	25,917	0
1959–64	638	148,166	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	98	88,170	0
1959–64	513	622,788	4
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	292	69,839	0
1959–64	1,328	384,443	2
Secondary:			
1963–64	301	395,522	2
1959–64	1,278	1,644,705	12
Combined:			
1963–64	29	20,069	0
1959–64	209	229,314	3

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Feeral, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$296,106
Mathematics	24,410
Modern foreign languages	105,352
Source:	
Federal*	212,934
State	0
Local	212,934

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, aginst fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$86,298	$163,823
1959–64	868,129	993,381

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign languages	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$19,364
State	21,381

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	187	114,207
Eligible under State plan	187	114,207
Participating	141	102,275

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.35
Supervisory	3
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	1.5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$19,364	$20,000
1959–64	93,142	120,000

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	407	$2,096,513	58
1959-64	1,924	11,049,186	373
Mathematics:			
1963-64	264	231,715	0
1959-64	1,248	1,000,834	19
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	205	499,289	10
1959-64	910	2,567,965	56
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	233	222,785	4
1959-64	1,136	1,093,957	23
Secondary:			
1963-64	336	970,343	23
1959-64	1,631	5,255,515	169
Combined:			
1963-64	307	1,634,389	41
1959-64	1,315	8,268,513	256

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963-64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,770,574
Mathematics	142,604
Modern foreign languages	435,072
Source:	
Federal*	1,164,346
State	0
Local	1,183,904

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$1,161,027	$1,255,502
1959-64	6,116,831	6,211,791

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963-64

Source	Amount
Federal	$54,209
State	54,209

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies 1963-64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	599	1,197,290
Eligible under State plan	599	1,197,299
Participating	409	1,070,559

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963-64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.75
Supervisory	4.5
Related services	1
Secretarial, clerical	5.64

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$54,209	$64,157
1959-64	232,337	541,780

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	565	$795,383	2
1959–64	1,613	3,222,333	100
Mathematics:			
1963–64	182	62,646	0
1959–64	611	399,655	5
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	128	100,177	0
1959–64	464	693,631	10
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	325	245,028	0
1959–64	950	619,944	1
Secondary:			
1963–64	550	713,178	2
1959–64	1,560	2,312,338	38
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	178	1,383,337	76

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$596,792
Mathematics	48,064
Modern foreign languages	80,243
Source:	
Federal*	362,537
State	0
Local	362,562

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	$28,243
1959–64	$1,746,248	1,979,792

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0.75
Mathematics	.75
Modern foreign language	.75

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$31,060
State	31,060

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	97	249,242
Eligible under State plan	97	249,242
Participating	83	231,229

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.75
Supervisory	2.25
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$31,060	$31,295
1959–64	134,082	139,201

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	656	$5,052,693	33
1959–64	3,494	23,909,094	799
Mathematics:			
1963–64	443	581,611	0
1959–64	2,241	2,771,662	11
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	441	1,135,399	6
1959–64	2,409	7,412,429	90
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	113	95,352	0
1959–64	547	427,149	9
Secondary:			
1963–64	620	1,095,120	15
1959–64	3,629	6,140,706	122
Combined:			
1963–64	807	5,579,231	24
1959–64	3,968	27,525,331	769

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$5,052,693
Mathematics	581,611
Modern foreign languages	1,135,399
Source:	
Federal*	3,384,839
State	0
Local	3,384,864

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$3,042,769	$3,641,538
1959–64	16,571,316	17,189,782

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	2
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	3
Supervisory	4
Related services	8
Secretarial, clerical	14

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$384,926
State	386,803

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$384,926	$387,435
1959–64	1,444,519	1,684,910

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1,103	3,050,000
Eligible under State plan	838	3,050,000
Participating	656	2,937,466

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	2,047	$5,792,207	27
1959–64	6,535	18,111,163	150
Mathematics:			
1963–64	1,137	945,443	6
1959–64	3,604	3,274,379	6
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	650	1,345,662	1
1959–64	2,263	3,578,376	12
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	1,352	1,516,475	12
1959–64	4,516	5,649,576	13
Secondary:			
1963–64	1,077	2,238,527	14
1959–64	3,489	6,960,032	131
Combined:			
1963–64	1,405	4,328,310	8
1959–64	4,397	12,334,310	24

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$4,210,593
Mathematics	505,768
Modern foreign languages	877,871
Source:	
Federal*	2,797,116
State	0
Local	2,797,116

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$996,620	$1,528,419
1959–64	9,839,055	10,982,622

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	3
Mathematics	2
Modern foreign language	3

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	3.0
Supervisory	8.0
Related services	1.5
Secretarial, clerical	12.0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$95,259
State	95,259

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$95,259	$100,506
1959–64	280,882	550,913

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	187	1,154,184
Eligible under State plan	187	1,154,184
Participating	179	1,151,609

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	579	$556,629	40
1959–64	1,923	2,983,454	271
Mathematics:			
1963–64	122	28,606	1
1959–64	323	60,396	1
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	60	11,784	0
1959–64	175	106,911	3
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	14	5,643	0
1959–64	36	12,773	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	28	12,694	0
1959–64	53	26,143	4
Combined:			
1963–64	719	578,682	41
1959–64	2,332	3,111,845	271

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$481,295
Mathematics	28,594
Modern foreign languages	8,214
Source:	
Federal*	256,478
State	0
Local	261,625

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$245,011	$245,011
1959–64	1,474,679	1,559,824

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1.063
Mathematics	.125
Modern foreign language	.063

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.75
Supervisory	1.25
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	3.25

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$25,000
State	33,464

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$25,000	$25,000
1959–64	99,709	125,000

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	660	139,171
Eligible under State plan	660	139,171
Participating	200	109,312

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	1,500	$4,686,213	186
1959–64	7,217	23,940,495	1,167
Mathematics:			
1963–64	838	698,005	11
1959–64	3,808	2,678,386	125
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	629	834,612	8
1959–64	2,774	4,438,124	93
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	507	444,443	13
1959–64	2,379	1,664,227	106
Secondary:			
1963–64	1,191	2,531,256	69
1959–64	5,353	13,334,285	546
Combined:			
1963–64	1,269	3,243,131	123
1959–64	6,067	16,058,493	733

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$6,260,290
Mathematics	900,318
Modern foreign languages	1,075,466
Source:	
Federal*	4,118,037
State	0
Local	4,118,037

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$3,102,247	$3,135,992
1959–64	14,290,023	14,323,768

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.3
Supervisory	5.0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	3.0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$55,332
State	59,921

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$55,332	$59,990
1959–64	223,603	896,163

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	791	2,163,443
Eligible under State plan	791	2,163,443
Participating	703	1,998,173

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	690	$1,313,706	35
1959–64	3,191	6,573,423	353
Mathematics:			
1963–64	444	482,472	4
1959–64	1,875	1,627,349	18
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	201	250,439	6
1959–64	777	1,408,766	56
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	329	77,822	0
1959–64	1,405	374,950	6
Secondary:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	262	675,951	57
Combined:			
1963–64	1,006	1,968,795	45
1959–64	4,176	8,558,638	364

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,252,327
Mathematics	452,766
Modern foreign languages	243,270
Source:	
Federal*	957,730
State	8,929
Local	981,704

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$625,070	$761,011
1959–64	4,627,688	4,763,695

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	2.1
Supervisory	7.0
Related services	.5
Secretarial, clerical	5.5

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$50,501
State	64,486

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$50,501	$51,234
1959–64	251,405	263,273

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1,152	586,057
Eligible under State plan	1,152	586,057
Participating	637	495,077

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	453	$1,157,871	31
1959–64	1,932	4,879,401	200
Mathematics:			
1963-64	164	195,948	2
1959–64	709	790,897	23
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	140	309,885	3
1959–64	514	1,385,420	57
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	267	327,581	1
1959–64	1,141	1,249,853	40
Secondary:			
1963–64	293	855,766	24
1959–64	1,107	3,108,107	116
Combined:			
1963–64	197	480,357	11
1959–64	907	2,697,757	124

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,144,742
Mathematics	178,324
Modern foreign languages	294,295
Source:	
Federal*	788,842
State	0
Local	828,519

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$622,814	$745,092
1959–64	3,121,741	3,245,975

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$36,692
State	36,772

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	445	425,093
Eligible under State plan	445	425,093
Participating	266	393,832

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	2.25
Supervisory	3
Related services	.75
Secretarial, clerical	3

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$36,692	$36,692
1959–64	173,934	204,660

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	4,360	$6,926,122	16
1959–64	17,091	23,252,661	88
Mathematics:			
1963–64	1,266	877,520	0
1959–64	7,831	3,086,662	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	986	1,008,097	0
1959–64	6,158	7,044,322	13
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	2,815	2,086,671	0
1959–64	12,633	7,835,537	2
Secondary:			
1963–64	3,797	6,725,068	16
1959–64	18,394	25,300,147	99
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	53	247,963	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$6,496,710
Mathematics	744,874
Modern foreign languages	1,212,116
Source:	
Federal*	4,226,850
State	0
Local	4,226,850

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$1,652,123	$2,530,853
1959–64	12,118,347	15,967,266

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	5.15
Mathematics	2.15
Modern foreign language	4.65

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$235,423
State	253,698

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	953	2,041,162
Eligible under State plan	953	2,041,162
Participating	776	2,039,020

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	2.4
Supervisory	16.2
Related services	8.3
Secretarial, clerical	17.5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$235,423	$235,423
1959–64	1,005,799	1,173,768

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	124	$391,634	0
1959–64	430	1,527,730	27
Mathematics:			
1963–64	73	59,090	4
1959–64	184	176,551	4
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	48	81,275	0
1959–64	154	391,779	1
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	93	117,039	0
1959–64	300	526,027	19
Secondary:			
1963–64	152	414,960	4
1959–64	468	1,570,033	13
Combined:			
1963–64	0		0
1959–64	0		

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$246,663
Mathematics	36,421
Modern foreign languages	105,780
Source:	
Federal*	194,432
State	0
Local	194,432

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$13,772	$94,428
1959–64	741,074	1,018,380

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.5
Supervisory	3.0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	2.0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$25,000
State	26,432

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$25,000	$25,000
1959–64	99,076	125,000

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	42	134,128
Eligible under State plan	42	134,128
Participating	31	122,826

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	2,087	$1,347,261	29
1959–64	8,571	5,771,027	209
Mathematics:			
1963–64	870	208,328	0
1959–64	3,141	760,327	36
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	438	140,315	3
1959–64	1,648	591,093	16
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	1,724	693,185	2
1959–64	6,620	2,748,207	110
Secondary:			
1963–64	1,671	1,002,719	30
1959–64	6,740	4,374,240	151
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0		0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,347,261
Mathematics	208,329
Modern foreign languages	140,315
Source:	
Federal*	847,949
State	64,362
Local	783,594

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	$207,000
1959–64	$3,551,316	5,561,876

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$56,271
State	63,004

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	109	645,848
Eligible under State plan	107	642,205
Participating	107	642,205

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	4
Supervisory	6
Related services	1
Secretarial, clerical	5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$56,271	$58,369
1959–64	290,921	316,042

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	242	$185,911	5
1959-64	1,568	2,155,747	159
Mathematics:			
1963-64	93	42,191	2
1959-64	607	293,681	19
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	31	7,941	0
1959-64	271	327,006	8
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	223	41,293	0
1959-64	977	461,353	11
Secondary:			
1963-64	127	140,957	7
1959-64	1,356	2,007,815	167
Combined:			
1963-64	16	53,793	0
1959-64	113	307,266	8

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$339,030
Mathematics	55,018
Modern foreign languages	56,370
Source:	
Federal*	220,320
State	0
Local	230,098

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, aganst fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	0	$57,740
1959-64	$1,114,716	1,415,772

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0.375
Mathematics	.375
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$15,215
State	15,215

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	2,013	158,693
Eligible under State plan	1,935	157,622
Participating	212	Not available

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.33
Supervisory	.75
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	2

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$15,215	$16,000
1959-64	66,298	116,000

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	178	$1,624,507	13
1959-64	839	7,357,265	73
Mathematics:			
1963-64	84	354,931	0
1959-64	312	1,049,814	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	73	469,830	0
1959-64	290	1,623,200	5
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	63	230,885	0
1959-64	185	571,853	2
Secondary:			
1963-64	65	523,636	6
1959-64	116	733,163	7
Combined:			
1963-64	207	1,694,747	7
1959-64	1,140	8,725,261	69

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,323,978
Mathematics	254,802
Modern foreign languages	225,130
Source:	
Federal*	901,955
State	0
Local	901,955

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	$4,176,614	$6,985,615

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	2.0
Mathematics	1.0
Modern foreign language	1.5

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$53,983
State	53,983

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	154	849,842
Eligible under State plan	154	849,842
Participating	108	738,482

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.5
Supervisory	7.583
Related services	1
Secretarial, clerical	4.583

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$53,983	$63,699
1959–64	262,141	396,297

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	684	$4,288,816	163
1959-64	4,415	22,392,951	1,475
Mathematics:			
1963-64	346	368,510	0
1959-64	2,063	1,771,847	34
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	280	888,256	3
1959-64	1,147	4,220,388	85
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	79	33,702	0
1959-64	2,149	3,234,669	554
Secondary:			
1963-64	600	1,447,422	13
1959-64	4,241	16,640,769	802
Combined:			
1963-64	631	4,064,458	153
1959-64	1,235	8,509,748	238

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$3,563,281
Mathematics	354,943
Modern foreign languages	695,796
Source:	
Federal*	2,307,010
State	0
Local	2,307,010

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	0	$208,522
1959-64	$10,326,501	16,560,186

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	6
Mathematics	2
Modern foreign language	3

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.666
Supervisory	11.5
Related services	1
Secretarial, clerical	5.5

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$180,386
State	183,184

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$180,386	$205,125
1959-64	458,906	1,094,069

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1,435	2,167,797
Eligible under State plan	1,344	2,199,006
Participating	703	1,365,465

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	622	$874,386	29
1959-64	2,933	2,797,350	96
Mathematics:			
1963-64	228	68,496	0
1959-64	1,307	304,423	3
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	138	135,749	72
1959-64	760	512,618	87
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	520	313,421	74
1959-64	2,950	1,007,295	82
Secondary:			
1963-64	465	742,563	27
1959-64	2,045	2,581,950	104
Combined:			
1963-64	3	22,647	0
1959-64	5	25,147	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$978,041
Mathematics	155,686
Modern foreign languages	101,121
Source:	
Federal*	617,424
State	8,392
Local	609,032

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$260,538	$366,614
1959-64	1,517,549	2,188,644

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$26,084
State	26,084

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	40	268,174
Eligible under State plan	40	268,174
Participating	37	227,128

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.75
Supervisory	3
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	2

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$26,084	$31,430
1959-64	119,671	136,050

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	151	$147,555	4
1959-64	1,159	1,070,124	72
Mathematics:			
1963-64	42	10,562	0
1959-64	392	53,808	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	41	84,353	0
1959-64	374	246,850	14
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	127	34,299	3
1959-64	939	321,337	18
Secondary:			
1963-64	107	208,171	1
1959-64	986	1,049,446	68
Combined:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$324,377
Mathematics	13,879
Modern foreign languages	105,344
Source:	
Federal*	221,798
State	0
Local	221,802

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$93,892	$123,974
1959-64	591,957	782,710

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0.5
Mathematics	.5
Modern foreign language	1.0

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	2
Supervisory	2
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$12,867
State	12,867

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$12,867	$15,500
1959-64	62,262	115,500

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	257	79,473
Eligible under State plan	257	79,473
Participating	137	60,996

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	735	$1,405,237	0
1959–64	3,562	8,296,563	0
Mathematics:			
1963–64	287	157,308	0
1959–64	1,491	761,078	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	247	363,390	0
1959–64	1,246	2,192,343	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	333	626,306	0
1959–64	1,345	2,656,707	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	936	1,299,629	0
1959–64	4,954	8,593,278	0
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,468,154
Mathematics	146,907
Modern foreign languages	380,754
Source:	
Federal*	989,796
State	125,000
Local	881,019

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	$4,584,591	$6,867,219

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	4.25
Mathematics	4.10
Modern foreign language	1.38

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$10,893
State	11,042

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	130	895,730
Eligible under State plan	129	895,730
Participating	121	842,901

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.95
Supervisory	9.73
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$10,893	$16,919
1959–64	76,862	378,349

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	511	$1,643,651	60
1959–64	2,268	6,760,557	223
Mathematics:			
1963–64	219	243,771	0
1959–64	970	1,120,120	71
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	185	506,312	24
1959–64	906	2,768,239	497
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	304	732,650	74
1959–64	1,583	3,459,835	476
Secondary:			
1963–64	599	1,607,892	10
1959–64	2,408	6,862,996	114
Combined:			
1963–64	12	53,192	0
1959–64	153	326,083	201

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,806,229
Mathematics	255,044
Modern foreign languages	597,883
Source:	
Federal*	1,329,578
State	0
Local	1,329.578

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$945,006	$1,121,457
1959–64	4,603,689	4,780,140

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$83,697
State	83,697

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	433	646,651
Eligible under State plan	433	646,651
Participating	218	627,116

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	4
Supervisory	3
Related services	4.36
Secretarial, clerical	6.5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$83,697	$83,754
1959–64	208,063	338,629

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	1,142	$1,311,166	8
1959-64	3,091	5,850,244	387
Mathematics:			
1963-64	407	228,642	1
1959-64	1,234	1,109,328	11
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	206	182,557	9
1959-64	625	732,459	66
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	710	594,334	1
1959-64	2,008	2,402,931	34
Secondary:			
1963-64	1,045	1,128,031	17
1959-64	2,914	5,133,821	422
Combined:			
1963-64	0	0	0
1959-64	28	155,279	8

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$1,311,166
Mathematics	228,642
Modern foreign languages	182,557
Source:	
Federal*	861,183
State	0
Local	861,182

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$131,175	$184,634
1959-64	3,934,937	4,228,208

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$53,663
State	53,663

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	55	442,239
Eligible under State plan	55	442,239
Participating	55	442,239

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	3
Supervisory	5
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	4

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$53,663	$53,668
1959-64	240,429	251,080

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963-64	416	$3,708,635	55
1959-64	2,484	12,117,309	200
Mathematics:			
1963-64	295	389,728	0
1959-64	1,445	946,891	4
Modern foreign languages:			
1963-64	247	822,747	10
1959-64	993	2,564,767	56
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963-64	102	125,800	1
1959-64	734	481,223	9
Secondary:			
1963-64	83	258,522	10
1959-64	552	1,290,856	34
Combined:			
1963-64	773	4,536,788	54
1959-64	3,636	13,856,888	217

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$3,357,932
Mathematics	333,569
Modern foreign languages	756,091
Source:	
Federal*	2,154,276
State	0
Local	2,293,316

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 and 1964 allotments.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$1,625,589	$1,625,589
1959-64	7,261,244	7,396,581

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$39,588
State	39,588

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	695	799,560
Eligible under State plan	695	799,560
Participating	422	671,541

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	1.5
Supervisory	4.0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	3.4

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963-64	$39,588	$46,579
1959-64	157,084	397,978

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	43	105,620	2
Mathematics:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	15	4,210	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	18	77,456	3
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	14	17,759	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	62	169,527	5
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign languages	0
Source:	
Federal	0
State	0
Local	0

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64*	$234,641	$519,851

*State did not participate in fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964.

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	0
State	0

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	0	0
Eligible under State plan	0	0
Participating	0	0

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0
Supervisory	0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	$28,163	$100,000

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0
Mathematics:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign languages	0
Source:	
Federal	0
State	0
Local	0

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	0	$245,000

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0
Supervisory	0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	0
State	0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	0	$44,000

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	0	9
Eligible under State plan	0	0
Participating	0	0

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	2	$23,881	0
1959–64	14	168,067	3
Mathematics:			
1963–64	2	9,576	0
1959–64	9	39,410	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	1	8,387	2
1959–64	10	37,128	5
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	0	0	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	1	8,387	2
1959–64	9	31,198	5
Combined:			
1963–64	4	33,457	0
1959–64	24	213,407	3

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$23,881
Mathematics	9,576
Modern foreign languages	8,388
Source:	
Federal*	20,923
State	10,461
Local	10,461

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	$121,782	$245,000

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	0
Mathematics	0
Modern foreign language	0

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$4,654
State	4,654

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1	15,234
Eligible under State plan	1	15,234
Participating	1	15,234

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0.5
Supervisory	1.0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	1.0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$4,654	$5,503
1959–64	23,107	49,503

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	1,641	$704,946	13
1959–64	3,780	2,689,395	63
Mathematics:			
1963–64	572	98,145	0
1959–64	1,389	339,176	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	25	28,645	0
1959–64	35	64,268	2
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	235	192,395	0
1959–64	1,142	966,813	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	1,935	621,104	13
1959–64	3,917	2,093,629	65
Combined:			
1963–64	68	18,237	0
1959–64	145	32,396	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$704,695
Mathematics	97,241
Modern foreign languages	28,686
Source:	
Federal*	415,311
State	412,488
Local	2,823

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	$1,579,478	$3,800,008

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	15.0
Mathematics	10.0
Modern foreign language	.5

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$59,497
State	76,296

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1	600,406
Eligible under State plan	1	600,406
Participating	1	600,406

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	5.0
Supervisory	27.0
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	4.5

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$59,497	$59,497
1959–64	170,860	173,497

EQUIPMENT AND REMODELING

TABLE 1.—Projects Approved

Subject	Number	Cost	Rooms remodeled
Science:			
1963–64	2	$8,396	1
1959–64	18	95,146	1
Mathematics:			
1963–64	2	6,566	0
1959–64	13	20,636	0
Modern foreign languages:			
1963–64	1	1,451	0
1959–64	11	36,510	0
Level:			
Elementary:			
1963–64	2	9,431	0
1959–64	11	55,094	0
Secondary:			
1963–64	3	6,982	1
1959–64	30	97,149	1
Combined:			
1963–64	0	0	0
1959–64	1	49	0

TABLE 2.—Expenditures, Federal, State, Local, 1963–64

Subject	Amount
Science	$12.753
Mathematics	6,566
Modern foreign languages	1,451
Source:	
Federal*	10,385
State	10,385
Local	0

*Reported expenditures as of June 30, 1964, against fiscal year 1963 allotment only.

TABLE 3.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	0	0
1959–64	$76,057	$245,00

STATE SUPERVISION AND ADMINISTRATION

TABLE 4.—Subject-Matter Specialists, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Subject	Number
Science	1
Mathematics	1
Modern foreign language	1

TABLE 6.—Expenditures, 1963–64

Source	Amount
Federal	$10,000
State	12,645

TABLE 8.—Local Educational Agencies, 1963–64

Category	Number	Average daily membership
Total	1	8,409
Eligible under State plan	1	8,409
Participating	1	8,409

TABLE 5.—Regular Title III Personnel, Full Time or Equivalent, 1963–64

Function	Number
Administrative	0
Supervisory	3
Related services	0
Secretarial, clerical	0

TABLE 7.—Utilization of Federal Funds

Period	Expenditure	Allotment
1963–64	$10,000	$10,000
1959–64	42,630	54,000

Loans Approved Under Title III to Nonprofit Private Schools by State: Fiscal Year 1964

School, by State	*Amount of loan*
Total	$520,780
CALIFORNIA	
The Anna Head School, Berkeley	6,000
The College Preparatory School, Oakland	2,950
Ojai Valley School, Ojai	8,000
COLORADO	
Colorado Academy, Denver	10,000
Saint Mary's Academy High School, Englewood	6,400
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
The Hawthorne School, Washington	17,000
FLORIDA	
Monsignor Edward Pace High School, Opa-locka	3,260
St. John Vianney High School, Miami	1,760
ILLINOIS	
Assumption High School, East St. Louis	12,000
Loyola Academy, Wilmette	12,000
St. Laurence High School, Oak Lawn	10,000
Telshe High School, Chicago	2,760
INDIANA	
Bennett High School, Marion	5,100
KANSAS	
St. Patrick High School, Parsons	9,000
MASSACHUSETTS	
St. John's Preparatory School, Danvers	65,000
The Stockbridge School, Interlaken	10,000
MICHIGAN	
Hacket High School, Kalamazoo	45,250
St. Stephen High School, Saginaw	5,000
MINNESOTA	
Duluth Cathedral High School, Duluth	6,150
St. Paul Lutheran High School, St. Paul	6,200
Southwest Minnesota Christian High School, Edgerton	6,000
NEW JERSEY	
Our Lady of Mercy Girls' Academy, Newfield	4,000
NEW YORK	
Baldwin School of New York City, New York	4,020
Brandeis School, Woodmere	9,350
Holy Family High School, Massena	8,060
Martin Luther High School, Maspeth	7,910
McBurney School, New York	8,400
Mesivta of Crown Heights, Brooklyn	24,200
Rockland Country Day School, Congers	3,500
St. Mary's Academy, Ogdensburg	4,410
Salesian High School, New Rochelle	31,000
Windward School, White Plains	3,400
Yeshivah Toroh V'Emunah, Bronx	15,000
OKLAHOMA	
St. John's Catholic School, McAlester	1,100
PENNSYLVANIA	
Mercyhurst Preparatory School, Erie	36,350
PUERTO RICO	
Antilles Military School, Trujillo Alto	46,650
Colegio San Ignacio de Loyola, Rio Piedras	4,800
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Cardinal Newman High School, Columbia	8,400
TEXAS	
Greenhill School, Dallas	46,900
VIRGINIA	
Massanutten Academy, Woodstock	3,500

Allotments, payments to States, and reported expenditures under title III, for State supervisory, related services, and administration of State plans, by State: fiscal year 1964

State or territory	Adjusted allotment	Payment [1]	Expenditures [2]
1	2	3	4
Totals	$3,365,570	$2,958,097	$3,106,384
Alabama	72,513	72,513	72,513
Alaska	13,500	10,433	12,431
Arizona	(3)	(3)	(3)
Arkansas	42,140	42,140	42,140
California	319,506	309,506	280,337
Colorado	37,166	37,166	[4] 37,166
Connecticut	31,000	31,000	27,739
Delaware	25,000	25,000	21,798
District of Columbia	20,000	20,000	20,000
Florida	104,632	104,632	104,632
Georgia	100,000	100,000	98,798
Hawaii	20,000	10,000	20,000
Idaho	20,000	20,000	19,761
Illinois	177,600	177,600	167,913
Indiana	63,164	31,582	25,669
Iowa	56,642	56,642	54,731
Kansas	30,000	30,000	28,805
Kentucky	48,735	48,735	34,106
Louisiana	72,039	0	72,039
Maine	22,000	22,000	22,000
Maryland	43,005	43,005	26,279
Massachusetts	76,750	76,750	60,897
Michigan	32,423	32,423	[4] 29,697
Minnesota	70,220	70,220	61,152
Mississippi	35,530	35,530	33,473
Missouri	70,000	64,983	59,822
Montana	20,000	20,000	18,448
Nebraska	19,230	19,230	16,198
Nevada	20,000	20,000	18,276
New Hampshire	20,000	20,000	19,364
New Jersey	64,157	64,157	54,209
New Mexico	31,295	31,295	31,060
New York	387,435	296,805	384,926
North Carolina	100,506	100,506	95,259
North Dakota	25,000	25,000	25,000
Ohio	59,990	59,990	55,332
Oklahoma	51,234	51,234	50,501
Oregon	36,692	36,692	36,692
Pennsylvania	235,423	235,423	235,423
Rhode Island	25,000	25,000	25,000
South Carolina	58,369	58,369	56,271
South Dakota	16,000	16,000	15,215
Tennessee	63,699	63,699	53,983
Texas	205,125	43,715	180,386
Utah	31,430	31,430	26,084
Vermont	15,500	15,000	12,867
Virginia	16,919	16,919	10,893
Washington	83,754	83,754	83,697
West Virginia	53,668	53,668	53,663
Wisconsin	46,579	24,170	39,588
Wyoming	(3)	(3)	(3)
Canal Zone	(3)	(3)	(3)
Guam	5,503	4,684	4,654
Puerto Rico	59,497	59,497	59,497
Virgin Islands	10,000	10,000	10,000

---

[1] Net Federal payments as of June 30, 1964. In some instances payments shown in column 3 include prior year's unexpended balances in the State that were applied against the 1964 allotment.

[2] Expenditures shown are subject to adjustment and in some instances include June 30, 1963, State treasury balances from Federal funds allotted to the State in fiscal year 1963.

[3] Arizona, Wyoming, and Canal Zone did not participate.

[4] Expenditures shown are subject to adjustment pending acceptable annual financial reports.

Unpaid balances of 1963 allotments, 1964 allotments, total available for payment in 1964, payments to States under title III for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling, and total reported State expenditures for these purposes, by State: Fiscal year 1964

State or territory 1	Unpaid balance of 1963 allotment 2	1964 adjusted allotment 3	Total available for payment in 1964 4	Payment[1] in 1964 5	Expenditures in 1964 6
Totals	$39,360,857	$42,631,020	$81,991,877	$51,831,965	$63,083,849
Alabama	1,298,435	33,866	1,332,301	1,000,000	1,166,932
Alaska	6,320	43,669	49,989	43,669	53,582
Arizona	454,149	(3)	454,149	(3)	(3)
Arkansas	683,842	241,434	925,276	925,276	809,332
California	2,671,891	5,239,528	7,911,419	5,411,419	5,291,107
Colorado	495,327	931,372	1,426,699	300,000	[4] 901,173
Connecticut	108,587	502,858	611,445	611,445	672,064
Delaware	0	276,216	276,216	276,216	263,263
District of Columbia	65,169	63,150	128,319	51,344	61,610
Florida	1,271,012	1,819,107	3,090,119	3,090,119	2,295,288
Georgia	1,530,710	1,521,878	3,052,588	1,530,710	2,555,173
Hawaii	108,735	43,564	152,299	40,000	126,136
Idaho	225,310	28,910	254,220	254,220	250,418
Illinois	1,728,396	2,310,649	4,039,045	2,084,233	3,344,099
Indiana	1,044,571	1,234,896	2,279,467	1,200,000	1,126,837
Iowa	440,338	864,952	1,305,290	1,305,290	1,329,073
Kansas	166,105	344,284	510,389	392,321	621,604
Kentucky	1,151,279	127,059	1,278,338	1,276,338	897,496
Louisiana	1,288,335	300,000	1,588,335	0	866,505
Maine	306,275	138,225	444,500	356,817	305,768
Maryland	697,752	1,425,189	2,122,941	697,752	1,860,465
Massachusetts	0	1,716,636	1,716,636	1,716,636	2,012,406
Michigan	1,953,417	2,706,559	4,659,976	1,009,809	[4] 2,694,837
Minnesota	450,000	1,193,357	1,643,357	993,357	1,818,472
Mississippi	903,133	522,078	1,425,211	875,000	197,511
Missouri	1,036,633	523,171	1,559,804	1,559,804	1,487,173
Montana	51,437	180,611	232,048	232,048	233,550
Nebraska	413,729	200,451	614,180	614,180	418,255
Nevada	0	71,909	71,909	71,909	61,672
New Hampshire	111,027	163,823	274,850	234,392	212,934
New Jersey	0	1,255,502	1,255,502	1,255,502	1,164,346
New Mexico	383,745	28,243	411,988	411,987	362,537
New York	2,629,330	3,641,538	6,270,868	2,862,481	3,384,839
North Carolina	1,559,927	1,528,419	3,088,346	3,088,346	2,797,116
North Dakota	0	245,011	245,011	245,011	256,477
Ohio	1,000,000	3,135,992	4,135,992	2,484,210	4,118,037
Oklahoma	0	761,011	761,011	761,011	957,730
Oregon	0	745,092	745,092	745,092	788,842
Pennsylvania	2,574,727	2,530,853	5,105,580	1,830,533	4,226,850
Rhode Island	180,660	94,428	275,088	275,000	194,432
South Carolina	1,007,007	207,000	1,214,007	957,000	847,949
South Dakota	238,582	57,740	296,322	296,322	220,320
Tennessee	1,328,731	0	1,328,731	1,300,000	901,955
Texas	3,157,259	208,522	3,365,781	1,975,000	2,307,010
Utah	356,886	366,614	723,500	723,500	617,424
Vermont	80,510	123,974	204,484	204,484	221,798
Virginia	1,322,988	0	1,322,988	1,137,168	989,796
Washington	429,593	1,121,457	1,551,050	751,228	1,329,578
West Virginia	730,008	184,634	914.642	914,642	861,183
Wisconsin	740,164	1,625,589	2,365,753	969,492	2,154,276
Wyoming	101,479	(3)	101,479	(3)	(3)
Canal Zone	50,000	(3)	50,000	(3)	(3)
Guam	50,000	0	50,000	22,852	20,923
Puerto Rico	727,347	0	727,347	450,000	415,311
Virgin Islands	50,000	0	50,000	16,800	10,385

---

[1] Net Federal payments as of June 30, 1964. Payments shown in column 5 include amounts shown in column 2. Payments in column 5 are adjusted reflecting prior year's balances in the States.

[2] Expenditures reported by States shown in column 6 are subject to adjustment and in some instances include June 30, 1963, State treasury balances from Federal funds allotted to the States in fiscal year 1963.

[3] Arizona, Wyoming, and the Canal Zone did not participate.

[4] Expenditures shown are subject to adjustment pending acceptable annual financial reports.

Title III, NDEA, allotments for grants to States for acquisition of equipment, fiscal year 1964

State or outlying part	October 1963, allotment	March 1964, revision	May 1964, revision
Total	$47,520,000	$42,421,237	$42,631,020
Alabama	1,283,866	1,283,866	33,866
Alaska	52,394	43,669	43,669
Arizona	483,517	0	0
Arkansas	666,434	241,434	241,434
California	2,739,528	4,739,528	5,239,528
Colorado	513,438	741,372	931,372
Connecticut	417,858	462,858	502,858
Delaware	79,792	268,592	276,216
Florida	1,322,107	1,819,107	1,819,107
Georgia	1,521,878	1,521,878	1,521,878
Hawaii	154,564	14,564	43,564
Idaho	258,829	98,829	28,910
Illinois	1,710,649	2,310,649	2,310,649
Indiana	1,234,896	1,234,896	1,234,896
Iowa	824,952	824,952	864,952
Kansas	616,216	316,216	344,284
Kentucky	1,127,059	127,059	127,059
Louisiana	1,275,466	0	300,000
Maine	303,400	50,542	138,225
Maryland	771,534	1,118,150	1,425,189
Massachusetts	916,636	1,216,636	1,716,636
Michigan	1,956,559	2,856,559	2,706,559
Minnesota	1,043,357	1,193,357	1,193,357
Mississippi	894,645	522,078	522,078
Missouri	1,023,171	523,171	523,171
Montana	215,611	180,611	180,611
Nebraska	421,557	225,451	200,451
Nevada	$53,317	$71,909	$71,909
New Hampshire	163,823	163,823	163,823
New Jersey	985,502	1,255,502	1,255,502
New Mexico	401,821	106,142	28,243
New York	2,641,538	3,041,538	3,641,538
North Carolina	1,779,491	1,478,419	1,528,419
North Dakota	245,011	245,011	245,011
Ohio	2,235,992	2,235,992	3,135,992
Oklahoma	761,664	711,664	761,011
Oregon	495,092	595,092	745,092
Pennsylvania	2,530,853	2,530,853	2,530,853
Rhode Island	177,137	177,137	94,428
South Carolina	987,051	487,051	207,000
South Dakota	262,740	87,740	57,740
Tennessee	1,304,866	0	0
Texas	3,208,522	2,208,522	208,522
Utah	366,614	366,614	366,614
Vermont	123,974	123,974	123,974
Virginia	1,332,323	0	0
Washington	738,802	955,937	1,121,457
West Virginia	684,634	184,634	184,634
Wisconsin	1,125,589	1,325,589	1,625,589
Wyoming	106,399	0	0
District of Columbia	104,290	84,175	63,150
Canal Zone	50,000	0	0
Guam	50,000	47,895	0
Puerto Rico	723,042	0	0
Virgin Islands	50,000	0	0

Title III, number and percentage distribution of approved projects under title III for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling, by cost: Fiscal year 1964

Cost	Number of approved projects	Percent of total
Total	60,735	100.0
$0-$99	11,414	18.9
$100-$199	7,843	12.9
$200-$599	15,747	25.9
$600-$999	7,230	11.9
$1,000-$4,999	13,322	21.9
$5,000-$9,999	2,739	4.5
$10,000-$49,999	2,187	3.6
$50,000 and above	253	.4

	Fiscal year 1964	Total of 6 fiscal years, 1959-64
Number of approved projects	70,126	306,941
Estimated cost of approved projects	131.3	560.4
Estimated cost of science projects	95.8	412.2
Percent of total cost	73.0	73.6
Estimated cost of mathematics projects	14.2	51.0
Percent of total cost	10.8	9.1
Estimated cost of modern foreign language projects	21.3	97.2
Percent of total cost	16.2	17.3
Percent of estimated cost for elementary schools	16.1	16.9
Percent of estimated cost for secondary schools	47.6	48.6
Percent of estimated cost for combined elementary and secondary schools	36.3	34.5
Number of minor remodeling projects	947	7,860
Estimated cost of remodeling projects	5.9	24.5
Number of classrooms or laboratories involved in approved remodeling projects	2,862	20,591
Number in science	1,897	14,741
Number in mathematics	681	2,853
Number in modern foreign languages	284	2,997

NOTE

The variance between the total number of 60,735 projects and the total number of 70,126 projects reported in the two tables above has the following explanation:

If each subject area is counted as a "project" when more than one subject area is included in an approved project, then the total number of projects becomes 70,126 for purposes of financial reporting by fields of study.

The project breakdowns for the total of 60,735 are the following:

Projects	Number	Percent of projects	Total[1] cost	Percent of cost
1	2	3	4	5
Science	34,718	57.2	$95,813,967	73.0
Mathematics	11,745	19.3	14,183,902	10.8
Languages	7,781	12.8	21,329,045	16.2
Science and mathematics	2,929	4.8	0	0
Science and languages	608	1.0	0	0
Mathematics and languages	54	.1	0	0
Science, mathematics and languages	2,900	4.8	0	0
Total	[2] 60,735	[3] 100.0	[4] 131,326,914	100.0

---

[1] In the case of projects involving more than 1 subject area, an appropriate assignment of costs to the respective subject areas was made by the States and is shown in this column.

[2] See the first of the 2 tables.

[3] The figure 70,126 is the result of counting each subject area represented in the project as a separate "project" in cases where more than 1 subject area is included. This figure is arrived at as follows:

Science only	34,718
Mathematics only	11,745
Languages only	7,781
Science and mathematics (2,929×2)	5,858
Science and languages (608×2)	1,216
Mathematics and languages (54×2)	108
Science, mathematics, and languages (2,900×3)	8,700
Total	70,126

[4] Includes Federal, State, and local funds.

Distribution of total estimated costs for approved projects by subject area and by State: Fiscal year 1964

States	Total	Science	Percent	Mathematics	Percent	Modern foreign languages	Percent
Total	$131,326,914	$95,813,967	73.0	$14,183,902	10.8	$21,329,045	16.2
Alabama	2,410,237	1,769,494	73.3	341,425	14.2	299,318	12.5
Alaska	107,165	77,489	72.3	7,631	7.1	22,045	20.6
Arkansas	1,569,042	1,258,474	80.2	187,073	11.9	123,495	7.9
California	12,243,172	7,152,200	58.4	1,849,336	15.1	3,241,636	26.5
Colorado	1,921,036	1,365,136	71.0	155,221	8.1	400,679	20.9
Connecticut	1,034,472	534,059	51.6	182,006	17.6	318,407	30.8
Delaware	624,959	523,517	83.8	41,218	6.6	60,224	9.6
District of Columbia	123,219	86,649	70.3	17,412	14.1	19,158	15.6
Florida	5,011,182	3,394,794	67.7	689,692	13.8	926,696	18.5
Georgia	6,287,271	4,598,750	73.1	946,665	15.1	741,856	11.8
Hawaii	290,224	208,464	71.8	35,005	12.1	46,755	16.1
Idaho	506,619	384,884	76.0	64,933	12.8	56,802	11.2
Illinois	5,700,774	4,287,960	75.2	441,992	7.8	970,822	17.0
Indiana	2,685,693	2,120,768	78.9	149,145	5.6	415,780	15.5
Iowa	1,523,186	1,102,406	72.4	202,223	13.3	218,557	14.3
Kansas	1,308,463	993,260	76.0	94,776	7.2	220,427	16.8
Kentucky	2,566,396	1,961,533	76.4	331,202	12.9	273,661	10.7
Louisiana	1,868,135	1,510,537	80.8	107,586	5.8	250,012	13.4
Maine	750,602	576,416	76.8	37,818	5.0	136,368	18.2
Maryland	2,614,798	2,074,032	79.3	169,090	6.5	371,676	14.2
Massachusetts	4,024,812	2,921,390	72.5	376,680	9.4	726,742	18.1
Michigan	5,850,927	4,153,581	71.0	704,094	12.0	993,252	17.0
Minnesota	3,031,998	2,359,109	77.8	205,168	6.8	467,721	15.4
Mississippi	1,432,043	1,131,683	79.0	121,965	8.5	178,395	7.6
Missouri	2,446,245	1,878,361	76.8	248,199	10.1	319,685	13.1
Montana	426,171	346,888	81.4	28,338	6.6	50,945	12.0
Nebraska	673,567	485,526	72.1	56,738	8.4	131,303	19.5
Nevada	199,395	141,945	71.2	15,544	7.8	41,906	21.0
New Hampshire	485,430	371,343	76.5	25,917	5.3	88,170	18.2
New Jersey	2,827,517	2,096,513	74.1	231,715	8.2	499,289	17.7
New Mexico	958,206	795,383	83.0	62,646	6.5	100,177	10.5
New York	6,769,703	5,052,693	74.6	581,611	8.6	1,135,399	16.8
North Carolina	8,083,312	5,792,207	71.7	945,443	11.7	1,345,662	16.6
North Dakota	597,019	556,629	93.2	28,606	4.8	11,784	2.0
Ohio	6,218,830	4,686,213	75.4	698,005	11.2	834,612	13.4
Oklahoma	2,046,617	1,313,706	64.2	482,472	23.6	250,439	12.2
Oregon	1,663,704	1,157,871	69.6	195,948	11.8	309,885	18.6
Pennsylvania	8,811,739	6,926,122	78.6	877,520	10.0	1,008,097	11.4
Rhode Island	531,999	391,634	73.6	59,090	11.1	81,275	15.3
South Carolina	1,695,904	1,347,261	79.4	208,328	12.3	140,315	8.3
South Dakota	236,043	185,911	78.8	42,191	17.9	7,941	3.3
Tennessee	2,449,268	1,624,507	66.3	354,931	14.5	469,830	19.2
Texas	5,545,582	4,288,816	77.4	368,510	6.6	888,256	16.0
Utah	1,078,631	874,386	81.0	68,496	6.4	135,749	12.6
Vermont	242,470	147,555	60.9	10,562	4.4	84,353	34.7
Virginia	1,925,935	1,405,237	73.0	157,308	8.2	363,390	18.8
Washington	2,393,734	1,643,651	68.7	243,771	10.2	506,312	21.1
West Virginia	1,722,365	1,311,166	76.1	228,642	13.3	182,557	10.6
Wisconsin	4,921,110	3,708,635	75.4	389,728	7.9	822,747	16.7
Guam	41,844	23,881	57.1	9,576	22.9	8,387	20.0
Puerto Rico	831,736	704,946	84.8	98,145	11.8	28,645	3.4
Virgin Islands	16,413	8,396	51.2	6,566	40.0	1,451	8.8

Approved projects and Federal, State, and local funds involved for projects under title III, by field of study and grade level: Fiscal year 1964

Field of study	All approved projects and projects involving minor remodeling			Projects involving equipment[4]			Projects involving minor remodeling[5]			Number of classrooms and laboratory units involving remodeling
	Number[2]	Cost	Percent	Number	Cost	Percent	Number	Cost	Percent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Grand total[1]	[3] 70,126	$131,326,914	100.0	69,179	$125,462,412	100.0	947	$5,864,502	100.0	2,862
Elementary	24,635	21,187,467	16.1	24,578	21,108,620	16.8	57	78,847	1.4	273
Secondary	30,858	62,407,506	47.6	30,303	59,332,251	47.3	555	3,075,255	52.4	960
Combined elementary-secondary	14,633	47,731,941	36.3	14,298	45,021,541	35.9	335	2,710,400	46.2	1,629
Science	41,155	95,813,967	100.0	40,415	90,465,642	100.0	740	5,348,325	100.0	1,897
Elementary	15,274	14,960,579	15.6	15,228	14,889,490	16.5	46	71,089	1.3	177
Secondary	17,394	44,491,218	46.4	16,994	41,659,582	46.1	400	2,831,636	53.0	731
Combined elementary-secondary	8,487	36,362,170	38.0	8,193	33,916,570	37.4	294	2,445,600	45.7	989
Mathematics	17,628	14,183,902	100.0	17,577	14,030,146	100.0	51	153,756	100.0	681
Elementary	7,109	3,713,392	26.2	7,106	3,711,296	26.5	3	2,096	1.4	8
Secondary	6,499	4,951,224	34.9	6,468	4,884,505	34.8	31	66,719	43.4	59
Combined elementary-secondary	4,020	5,519,286	38.9	4,003	5,434,345	38.7	17	84,941	55.2	614
Languages	11,343	21,329,045	100.0	11,187	20,966,624	100.0	156	362,421	100.0	284
Elementary	2,252	2,513,496	11.8	2,244	2,507,834	12.0	8	5,662	1.6	88
Secondary	6,965	12,965,064	60.8	6,841	12,788,164	60.9	124	176,900	48.8	170
Combined elementary-secondary	2,126	5,850,485	27.4	2,102	5,670,626	27.1	24	179,859	49.6	26

---

[1] 48 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands had approved projects. Arizona, Canal Zone, and Wyoming did not participate.

[2] The project unit may be a county, district, township, or combination thereof.

[3] Where a single project resulted in funds approved for more than 1 of the subject areas (science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages), the funds were prorated for each subject area. Projects covering 2 or more subject areas are included in the total projects of each subject area. The number of projects *in this table overstates* the actual number. The actual number of projects is shown in the table on page 99.

[4] Column 2 minus column 8 equals column 5, and column 3 minus column 9 equals column 6.

[5] Minor remodeling portion of projects involving acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling.

Approved projects and Federal, State, and local funds involved for projects under title III, by field of study and grade level: Fiscal years 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964

Field of study	All approved projects and projects involving minor remodeling			Projects involving equipment [4]			Projects involving minor remodeling			Number of classrooms and laboratory units involving remodeling
	Number [2]	Cost	Percent	Number	Cost	Percent	Number	Cost	Percent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Grand total [1]	[3] 306,941	$560,436,635	100.0	299,081	$535,915,551	100.0	7,860	$24,521,084	100.0	20,591
Elementary	113,534	94,477,518	16.9	112,758	93,600,104	17.5	776	877,414	3.6	3,361
Secondary	133,001	272,597,810	48.6	128,297	258,770,629	48.3	4,704	13,827,181	56.4	7,726
Combined elementary-secondary	60,406	193,361,307	34.5	58,026	183,544,818	34.2	2,380	9,816,489	40.0	9,504
Science	177,814	412,214,447	100.0	171,588	390,570,307	100.0	6,226	21,644,140	100.0	14,741
Elementary	69,206	70,055,467	17.0	68,554	69,288,365	17.7	652	767,102	3.5	2,439
Secondary	73,387	194,126,256	47.1	69,826	181,742,905	46.6	3,561	12,383,351	57.2	5,953
Combined elementary-secondary	35,221	148,032,724	35.9	33,208	139,539,037	35.7	2,013	8,493,687	39.3	6,349
Mathematics	78,760	51,023,319	100.0	78,422	50,476,380	100.0	338	546,939	100.0	2,853
Elementary	33,122	14,454,565	28.3	33,073	14,417,213	28.6	49	37,352	6.8	170
Secondary	29,531	16,919,678	33.2	29,357	16,697,230	33.1	174	222,448	40.7	401
Combined elementary-secondary	16,107	19,649,076	38.5	15,992	19,361,937	38.3	115	287,139	52.5	2,282
Languages	50,367	97,198,869	100.0	49,071	94,868,864	100.0	1,296	2,330,005	100.0	2,997
Elementary	11,206	9,967,486	10.3	11,131	9,894,526	10.4	75	72,960	3.1	752
Secondary	30,083	61,551,876	63.3	29,114	60,330,494	63.6	969	1,221,382	52.4	1,372
Combined elementary-secondary	9,078	25,679,507	26.4	8,826	24,643,844	26.0	252	1,035,663	44.5	873

---

[1] Of 49 States with approved plans during fiscal year 1959, 31 had approved projects. In 1960, 49 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands had approved projects. Arizona and Canal Zone did not participate. In 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964; 48 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands had approved projects. Arizona, Canal Zone, and Wyoming did not participate.

[2] The project unit may be a county, district, township, or combination thereof.

[3] Where a single project resulted in funds approved for more than 1 of the subject-matter fields (science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages), the funds were prorated for each subject-matter field. Projects covering 2 or more subject areas are included in the total projects of each subject area. The number of projects in this table overstates the actual number. The actual number of projects is shown in the table on page 99.

[4] Column 2 minus column 8 equals column 5, and column 3 minus column 9 equals column 6. All moneys rounded to nearest dollar.

Number of approved projects under title III for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling by single and by combined subject areas, by State: Fiscal year 1964

State 1	Total 2	Science only 3	Mathematics only 4	Modern foreign languages only 5	Science and mathematics 6	Science and modern foreign languages 7	Mathematics and modern foreign languages 8	Science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages 9
Total	60,735	34,718	11,745	7,781	2,929	608	54	2,900
Alabama	1,733	948	116	55	399	55	7	153
Alaska	68	39	12	17	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	1,108	692	265	151	0	0	0	0
California	1,796	842	310	492	68	17	2	65
Colorado	252	143	45	53	5	3	0	3
Connecticut	388	224	80	84	0	0	0	0
Delaware	48	20	0	0	6	3	0	19
District of Columbia	112	38	36	38	0	0	0	0
Florida	946	332	47	84	168	44	6	265
Georgia	7,155	3,899	1,339	662	538	27	11	679
Hawaii	747	461	197	89	0	0	0	0
Idaho	304	197	61	46	0	0	0	0
Illinois	1,434	799	321	314	0	0	0	0
Indiana	927	598	159	145	10	3	0	12
Iowa	1,229	746	308	175	0	0	0	0
Kansas	768	505	138	125	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	2,204	1,499	448	257	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	1,596	1,058	371	166	0	0	0	1
Maine	647	407	136	104	0	0	0	0
Maryland	908	642	191	75	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	1,132	669	242	221	0	0	0	0
Michigan	426	145	3	7	62	48	2	159
Minnesota	1,313	719	400	194	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	600	242	16	45	149	30	1	117
Missouri	1,309	512	32	28	432	85	7	213
Montana	400	254	20	26	57	15	0	28
Nebraska	320	146	2	2	88	20	2	60
Nevada	141	83	31	27	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	594	378	110	88	8	0	0	10
New Jersey	409	117	2	0	85	28	0	177
New Mexico	875	565	182	128	0	0	0	0
New York	1,540	656	443	441	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	3,548	1,859	956	543	83	9	2	96
North Dakota	761	579	122	60	0	0	0	0
Ohio	1,620	600	57	57	334	125	6	441
Oklahoma	712	237	11	6	263	25	5	165
Oregon	695	419	130	112	6	0	0	28
Pennsylvania	6,612	4,360	1,266	986	0	0	0	0
Rhode Island	245	124	73	48	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	3,395	2,087	870	438	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	318	200	51	25	36	0	0	6
Tennessee	335	178	84	73	0	0	0	0
Texas	701	281	9	5	131	69	3	203
Utah	988	622	228	138	0	0	0	0
Vermont	234	151	42	41	0	0	0	0
Virginia	1,269	735	287	247	0	0	0	0
Washington	912	508	218	183	1	2	0	0
West Virginia	1,755	1,142	407	206	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	958	416	295	247	0	0	0	0
Guam	5	2	2	1	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	2,238	1,641	572	25	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	5	2	2	1	0	0	0	0

Number of approved projects and total estimated costs by educational level and by State: Fiscal years 1959–64

Number of classrooms and laboratories by educational level and by State: Fiscal years 1959–64

States	Elementary		Secondary		Combined		Elementary	Secondary	Combined
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Number	Cost			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total	113,533	$94,477,518	133,002	$272,597,810	60,406	$193,361,307	3,361	7,726	9,504
Alabama	7,455	3,092,210	6,882	7,436,862	1,302	2,523,308	34	288	36
Alaska	28	117,665	118	318,004	59	140,368	0	4	0
Arkansas	808	600,035	1,825	2,772,798	2,699	4,191,922	8	123	169
California	3,380	13,628,374	3,398	24,599,422	159	1,978,147	1,120	724	30
Colorado	374	1,120,348	954	4,377,558	306	1,379,315	11	153	21
Connecticut	690	762,806	957	2,893,259	539	2,516,716	1	44	24
Delaware	13	4,452	24	152,252	348	1,297,594	0	0	0
District of Columbia	626	120,008	516	867,116	35	113,829	0	92	1
Florida	1,266	1,845,846	2,108	8,153,415	2,066	7,777,058	8	118	328
Georgia	23,799	6,308,475	11,335	9,887,656	4,349	2,773,097	10	179	1
Hawaii	1,854	616,357	993	770,275	556	239,142	163	64	27
Idaho	344	542,902	748	2,176,619	0	0	3	125	0
Illinois	2,323	5,194,979	3,067	11,661,082	1,791	8,509,312	92	279	156
Indiana	846	1,177,586	1,725	8,116,007	1,904	6,342,149	6	205	71
Iowa	1,438	2,036,924	3,379	9,576,627	0	0	13	224	0
Kansas	1,380	1,368,742	2,259	4,533,190	417	1,592,885	37	198	54
Kentucky	3,387	4,263,740	4,283	9,457,067	1	4,701	19	229	0
Louisiana	3,438	1,197,917	1,187	1,597,697	3,156	3,520,885	23	57	210
Maine	1,124	646,842	1,016	2,061,508	379	631,582	0	0	0
Maryland	1,461	1,776,530	1,915	7,066,491	278	854,895	0	91	3
Massachusetts	1,260	1,933,250	3,078	9,746,097	534	2,017,658	63	413	15
Michigan	694	872,105	0	0	4,703	25,082,949	181	0	4,856
Minnesota	2,300	2,287,252	3,875	11,802,157	272	228,480	0	320	0
Mississippi	388	281,479	897	1,772,203	2,552	5,407,890	0	25	80
Missouri	4,258	3,297,506	5,761	7,087,501	1,105	631,106	7	183	2
Montana	800	433,920	1,037	1,453,500	233	228,319	10	75	19
Nebraska	617	581,200	1,768	3,760,675	554	766,453	35	250	37
Nevada	154	144,556	343	492,973	27	44,522	0	11	0
New Hampshire	1,328	384,443	1,278	1,644,705	209	229,314	2	12	3
New Jersey	1,136	1,093,957	1,631	5,255,515	1,315	8,268,513	23	169	256
New Mexico	950	619,944	1,560	2,312,338	178	1,383,337	1	38	76
New York	547	427,149	3,629	6,140,706	3,968	27,525,331	9	122	769
North Carolina	4,516	5,649,576	3,489	6,980,032	4,397	12,334,310	13	131	24
North Dakota	36	12,773	53	26,143	2,332	3,111,845	0	4	271
Ohio	2,379	1,664,227	5,353	13,334,285	6,067	16,058,493	106	546	733
Oklahoma	1,405	374,950	262	675,951	4,176	8,558,638	6	57	364
Oregon	1,141	1,249,853	1,107	3,108,107	907	2,697,757	40	116	124
Pennsylvania	12,633	7,835,537	18,394	25,300,147	53	247,963	2	99	0
Rhode Island	300	526,027	468	1,570,033	0	0	19	13	0
South Carolina	6,620	2,748,207	6,740	4,374,240	0	0	110	151	0
South Dakota	977	461,353	1,356	2,007,815	113	307,266	11	167	8
Tennessee	185	571,853	116	733,163	1,140	8,725,261	2	7	69
Texas	2,149	3,234,669	4,241	16,640,769	1,235	8,509,748	554	802	238
Utah	2,950	1,007,295	2,045	2,581,950	5	25,147	82	104	0
Vermont	939	321,337	986	1,049,446	0	0	18	68	0
Virginia	1,345	2,656,707	4,954	8,593,278	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	1,583	3,459,835	2,408	6,862,996	153	326,083	476	114	201
West Virginia	2,008	2,402,931	2,914	5,133,821	28	155,279	34	422	8
Wisconsin	734	481,223	552	1,290,856	3,636	13,856,888	9	34	217
Wyoming	14	17,759	62	169,527	0	0	0	5	0
Guam	0	0	9	31,198	24	213,407	0	5	3
Puerto Rico	1,142	966,813	3,917	2,093,629	145	32,396	0	65	0
Virgin Islands	11	55,094	30	97,149	1	49	0	1	0

In Fiscal year 1959, 29 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico had approved projects. In 1960, 49 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands had approved projects. Arizona and Canal Zone did not participate. In 1961, 1962, 1963, and 1964; 48 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands had approved projects. Arizona, Canal Zone, and Wyoming did not participate.

NOTE.—All moneys rounded to nearest dollar.

EA
from CETRIC

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION / U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE OE - 29065